

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. XI.—OCTOBER, 1886.—No. 44.

NATURE-WORSHIP—THE NEW RELIGION.

RELIGION, according to the derivation of the prince of pagan orators, who was guided only by the light of right reason, means an attentive pondering of divine things, a proper understanding of our relations to the Creator, a just appreciation of our dependence upon Him, and an humble recognition of His claims upon us. This appreciation and recognition, becoming habitual, beget in the soul a permanent disposition or inclination to render the Creator the worship due to Him, the homage of the intellect and the obedience of the will.

Taken in this sense, we must admit that religion is not a characteristic of the modern world. Modern thought is a revolt against the Creator, a challenge of His authority, a denial of His rights, an insubordination to His will. Yet are we, therefore, to infer, with Emerson and other professed leaders of modern society, that the human mind has become "self-dependent," "self-sustained," that it "needs no gift, no foreign force," and "resists all attempts to palm other rules and other measures on the spirit than its own"? Far from it. The religious sentiment is deep-seated in the human heart. Man's nature is essentially moral and religious; he can no more divest himself of all religious feeling than of his nature. Banish genuine religion with its hallowed rites and ceremonies, and there will appear in its stead a spurious religion with a superstitious cult and worship. Like Banquo's ghost,

it will not away. It has a message to deliver, and it will not leave you until you hear it. If you do not bend the knee to the Creator, you will bend it to the creature; if you do not adore the author of nature, you will adore nature itself.

Creatures, with the qualities flowing from them, fall under the general designation of nature and constitute the natural order. The Creator alone, with the attributes of His being, is above all nature and constitutes the supernatural order. To worship the Creator, as He should be worshipped, is true religion; to worship the creature is false religion, superstition, or idolatry.

Now, the Creator may manifest Himself to us by the light of right reason in a soul made to His own likeness; or He may manifest Himself to us by a special light, falling upon us like a reflection from His divine countenance. He may make known the manner in which He wishes to be worshipped by the natural revelation of creatures, pointing to the Creator from whose hands they sprang. Or he may make known the manner in which he wishes to be worshipped by the supernatural revelation of faith, poured down in floods from the "inaccessible light wherein he dwelleth."¹ Religion based upon the revelation of the creature is natural religion; religion based upon the revelation of faith is supernatural religion.

Having premised this much by way of definition, we may now distinguish, with Cardinal Manning, three periods of human reason in the history of mankind: a period in which the human reason wandered alone without revelation; a period in which the human reason, receiving the light of revelation, walked under the guidance of faith; a period in which the human reason, after forfeiting the light of revelation which it had, once more wanders alone without a guide, not as before worshipping the God of nature under the sensible form of an idol, but relegating the God of nature to the realms of the unknowable and worshipping nature itself as the only God.

To hasten the advent of this period is the avowed object of the self-constituted leaders of thought—of such men as Carlyle, Emerson, Matthew Arnold, Spencer, Harrison—who would fain persuade us that the old faith and the religion professed by our forefathers are out of date, and are soon to be superseded by "the creed of science" and "the religion of culture." They would resent it as a gross insult to be styled or thought irreligious. They irreligious! Nay, are they not praised by their admirers for their "deeply religious feeling"? Is not Mr. Emerson proclaimed by Professor Tyndall "a profoundly religious man"? Is he not compared by Oliver Wendell Holmes to the Messiah, and declared to be a man of such superior virtue and merit that his life ought to

¹ Four Great Evils, page 5.

be written as that of a saint? Are not George Eliot and others of the same stripe spoken of as "highly virtuous people"? Are they not all extolled as geniuses, and therefore, on the authority of Carlyle, to be considered as redeemers sent to work out the complete liberation of the race, as superior beings gifted with a divine intuition, and therefore not to be criticised, but to be heard with respectful awe?

They all set themselves up as the prophets of a new religion, as the apostles of a new Christianity, as the evangelists of a new gospel, commingling Judaism, Mahometanism, Buddhism and Christianity in one everlasting revelation, as the high priests of a new cult with symbols and rites expressive of religious thought in its present state of evolution. They often borrow the phraseology of the religion which they seek to destroy, and speak sanctimoniously of "revelations and creeds," of "mysteries and symbols," of a "trinity and an incarnation," of "sacraments and rituals." Should you happen unawares upon some detached excerpts from their writings, you would imagine that you were reading one of the mediæval Fathers, so interlarded are they with terms to which your ear has grown accustomed, so frequent are the allusions to practices to which your heart is attached.

Not that they have any respect for these practices; for, like Carlyle and Emerson, they are hostile to Christian ceremonies, which they condemn as hollow and insincere, as a lying imposture, as empty forms from which the substance has long since departed. Like Carlyle, they not unfrequently insult Christian piety by language such as he uses in his description of a London Sunday: "It is silent Sunday; the populace not yet admitted to the beer-shops, till the respectabilities conclude their rubric-mummies,—a much more audacious feat than beer." But, like Carlyle, who once felt himself attracted by the "dim light" in St. Paul's Cathedral and the "distant *Amen*" of the choristers, they know that sacred ceremonies speak a mystic language to the heart, and that the very names of truths learned in youth have a power to charm the ear. Under cover of these outward forms, they level their attacks not only at revealed religion, but at every religion which adores a Creator.

Their secret is betrayed by Matthew Arnold, one of the exponents of the "religion of culture." "Modern times," he writes, "find themselves with an immense amount of institutions, established facts, accredited dogmas, customs, rules, which have come to them from times not modern. In this system their life has to be carried forward; yet they have a sense that this system is not of their own creation, that it by no means corresponds exactly with the wants of their actual life; that for them it is customary, not

rational. The awakening of this sense is the awakening of the modern spirit. The modern spirit is now awake almost everywhere; the sense of a want of correspondence between the forms of modern Europe and its spirit . . . almost every one now perceives To remove this want of correspondence is beginning to be the settled endeavor of most persons of good sense. Dissolvents of the old European system of dominant ideas and facts we must all be, all of us who have any power of working; what we have to study is that we may not be acrid dissolvents of them."¹ Now, as an able writer in the *Dublin Review* reminds us, the greatest of these "established institutions" and "accredited dogmas" of which Mr. Arnold wishes to be a dissolvent, is Christianity.

Carlyle is even more explicit, when he assures us that, if ever we "are to recover that pure and high spirit of devotion, the loss of which, however we may disguise it or pretend to overlook it, can be hidden from no observant mind, it must be by travelling on the same path, or at least in the same direction, in which the Germans have already begun to travel;" that is, the path travelled by Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Schelling and others, the path afterwards travelled by Emerson until he discovered that "the true Christianity is a faith in the infinitude of man," that man is universal nature, and that nature is the god whom we ought to worship.

A professed Christian minister in a Christian pulpit tells us in a similar strain: "There is a perpetual evolution in religion. We may yet look forward to a grander and nobler form of worship, when the world will recognize God in everything, and the best Christians will be the most natural men and women."²

A recent critic in the *British Quarterly*, October, 1885, writes, in an article on Shelley, that this poet's hope in death is to be "made one with nature," that "he is one of the great brotherhood of prophets, or interpreters of nature," and in general that, "as this is an age of material science," so "it is an age of nature-poetry," and, of course, of nature-worship. Here is the clue to the whole system.

Modern science, known to be largely anti-religious, is looked upon by many timorous souls as the most dangerous adversary of religion. This, however, is a great mistake. Science addresses itself to the reason and can be combated by reason. It makes at least a show of argument, and can be met with real arguments. If a man does not despise logic as an intellectual jugglery, which only serves to confirm him in his skepticism; if he does not refuse to admit self-evident principles, to follow an argument, and to see a necessary conclusion correctly drawn from certain premises, it

¹ *Essays on Criticism*, page 158.

² Rev. R. L. Rexford, Universalist; sermon at the Church of Our Father, Detroit.

is no difficult task to disprove the groundless assertions and gratuitous assumptions, or to expose the lurking sophistries and fallacies of modern scientists.

The difficulty lies in the fact that man is not a pure intelligence guided by reason alone, but a compound being moved by sentiments, affections and passions. Reason, it is true, should preside as a queen over the inferior faculties; from her throne she should issue her mandates and be obeyed; she should never allow herself to be controlled, nor her vision to be obscured and her judgment to be warped by feeling. Unfortunately, we find that this is not always the case; we know by experience what Cardinal Newman calls the inadequacy of formal argument to convince even when it overpowers. To reach a man's reason, we must approach him through his prejudices, his inclinations, his tastes. To convince him of the true, we must gratify his sense of the beautiful, and appeal to what is human in him. This we can do most effectually by the medium of literature, of art, and of society. These are the ordinary channels of thought, and often exert a far greater influence than abstract reasoning or pure science, upon the religion and the morals of the masses. Now, these are at present enlisted in the service of the new religion of "culture" and of "nature-worship."

I. Literature has been well defined as beautiful human thought and right human feeling, expressed in choice human language. It is an image of a writer's thoughts and feelings, a photograph of his mind and heart. But it is more than this: it is a mirror of a nation's character and genius, of a nation's longings and aspirations, of a nation's virtues and vices, a reflection, as correct as its theology, of a nation's religion and morality.

Literature, it has been well said, is the embodiment of the pervading spirit of an age or country, or of what our German friends tersely call the *Zeitgeist*. "By literature," writes Cardinal Newman, "is meant the expression of thought in language; where by thought I mean the ideas, feelings, views, reasonings, and other operations of the human mind. Literature, then, is of a personal character; it consists in the enunciations and teachings of those who have a right to speak as representatives of their kind, and in whose words their brethren find an interpretation of their own sentiments, a record of their own experience, and a suggestion for their own judgments. A great author . . . is the one who has something to say and who knows how to say it. . . . I ascribe to him as his characteristic gift, in a large sense, the faculty of expression. . . . He expresses what all feel and all cannot say, and his sayings pass into proverbs among his people, and his

phrases become household words and idioms of their daily speech."¹

In this manner the noblest deeds of heroism and the purest acts of virtue are embalmed by literature in the hearts of the people and contribute in a mysterious way both to form the genius of the language and to mould the character of the nation. "What power has been more abiding," asks the writer in the *Dublin Review*, referred to above,² "than that of the masterpieces of genius, conceived in accordance with the moral law? They are with us to this day, not only those whose genius was the channel of inspiration and disclosed the counsels of the Most High; but Æschylus, and Homer, and Sophocles, and Pindar and Plato, the Grecian prophets; and Cicero, and Virgil, and Horace, a less glorious constellation, though likely to endure as long. These, too, had a gift from God and employed it, on the whole, as they were meant."

They are with us, let us add, the great classic authors of our own tongue, Shakespeare, and Milton, and Dryden, and Pope, and Addison, and Goldsmith, exhibiting, indeed, occasional signs of human frailty, yet, on the whole, so favorable to virtue and religion that, with a word of caution, they may be safely put into the hands of intelligent men and women.

They are with us, the early writers of our own land, the Bryants, and Longfellow, and Irvings, instinct with the moral life and health of a youthful nation, and offering at the shrine of virtue and religion the first-fruits of American genius. So free are most of them from any blame in point of religion—if we except slight prejudices against a venerable Church which they did not know—so free are they especially from any taint in point of morality, that, according to an English critic,³ they were found from the beginning in English homes, "on every young lady's book-shelf, where Byron was excluded and Tennyson half reluctantly admitted by maternal strictness."

How different the so-called modern school of "culture," whose spirit, according to the testimony of one of its leaders, is reactionary and anti-Christian, whose aim is to depict a world from which God is excluded and in which the moral laws have ceased to exist!⁴ In France this school started with Voltaire, the first of the "littérateurs" or "men of culture." Since his day popular French literature has had a blighting influence on religion and morality, bearing with it, wherever it was introduced, the germs of mental and moral disease, and infecting all the fountains of knowledge. There seems to

¹ Idea of a University.

² *Dublin Review*, July, 1885, page 50.

³ *British Quarterly*, October, 1885, article, "American Poets," etc.

⁴ *Dublin Review*, July, 1885, p. 48.

be in the very language a sort of contagion, that makes it particularly liable to breed pestilence among the people. Let us not be misunderstood. We do not yield, we trust, to any one in our admiration for the noble Catholic nation, with whose past exploits every page of history is luminous, nor in our appreciation of the beautiful tongue which was at one time, by universal consent, the language of cultivated European society. We know well that French was long the most common vehicle of Catholic thought and Catholic asceticism. We know well, as a learned English author has said, that "the giants of contemporary French literature, such as Châteaubriand, Gratra, Autran, Laprade, Montalembert, Dupanloup, and Lacordaire, have all been Catholics."¹ Nevertheless, with the same author, we must admit that "the principal writers in vogue in France, such as Sainte-Beuve, About, Sardou, and Alexandre Dumas, are all anti-Catholic in sentiment and feeling," and that "their works are deeply tinged with immorality." Yet these are the writers translated into English and most commonly read.

There is not one of the whole French school of "culture" whom, on the authority of reliable witnesses, a person can read without blushing and feeling disgraced. George Sand's writings, according to Lord Acton, are simply ignominious, Flaubert and Zola are utterly abominable, Theophile Gautier revolts from everything that in civilized countries has been called decent, the whole company of realistic romancers not only inculcate Atheism, but are unutterably vile and obscene.² Yet it is the writings of these men that constitute the popular literature of France, and create the popular sentiment.

Among the English speaking races the new school of "culture" is comparatively recent. It is not indigenous to the soil. Nevertheless, the sprig brought to England from across the Channel is already producing bitter fruit. Our own men of "culture," if less openly atheistical and less repulsively immoral than the French, are certainly more hypocritical and dogmatic. Unless you subscribe to their tenets, they tell you, like Carlyle and Emerson, that the highest sense, the "intuitive" principle "is not developed at all" in you, and stigmatize you as wholly "uncultured and un-æsthetic."

Strange to say, with all our boast of intellectual freedom, there are those among us who submit meekly to this dogmatizing, and believe that no one can think who has not studied Matthew Arnold and Emerson; that no one can write who has not read George Eliot and Swinburne. Emerson tells the "cultured" men and

¹ Henry Bellingham, M.A., M.P., *Social Aspects of Catholicism and Protestantism*.

² Dublin Review, *supra*.

women who assemble season after season at Concord: "I do not know what arguments are in reference to any expression of thought. I delight in telling what I think; but if you ask me how I dare say so, I am the most helpless of mortal men." He tells them: "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen, and philosophers, and divines. With consistency a great soul has simply nothing to do. . . . Speak what you think now in hard words, and to-morrow speak what to-morrow thinks in hard words again, though it contradict everything you said to-day."¹ At least this is his teaching as formulated in his writings.

And those "cultured" men and women admire his teaching and love to call him the "master." They refuse to sit with the fishermen of Galilee at the feet of the Redeemer; they discard the revelation of the Bible as not sufficiently advanced; they ridicule the inspiration of the Jewish prophets as not conformable to modern thought. Yet they sit at the feet of Ralph Waldo Emerson; they accept his dreams and conceits as the gospel of enlightenment; they reverence his dicta as oracles of wisdom. Religion of some kind men will have; revelation of some kind they will believe; inspiration of some kind they will admit—if not the inspiration of heaven, at least the inspiration of so-called genius too often erratic, unbalanced, and unsound.

Emerson tells those "cultured" men and women: "The true Christianity is a faith in the infinitude of man,"—man's mind "is the only almighty giver in part and in infancy,"—"his thought is the universe." He tells those "cultured" men and women that he cannot distinguish the clouds from himself:

"The clouds are rich and dark, the air serene,
So like the soul of me, what if 'twere me?"

And those "cultured" men and women believe him and think that they, too, are the clouds, the universe, the almighty giver, endowed with infinitude, the nature-God, whom they must worship. Was there ever such an exhibition of insanity outside of a madhouse? The writer of this paper is well acquainted with an unfortunate inmate of a lunatic asylum—perhaps he ought rather be called fortunate, because he is happy in his delusion—who fancies that he is God the Creator, and spends his days in making the universe over again. He experiences a difficulty, however, with regard to one animal. He cannot make up his mind whether he should make it a biped or a quadruped. As soon as he has resolved this difficulty to his own satisfaction, the face of the world will be renewed. The realization of this difficulty seems to indicate that there is at least one sound spot in his mind. Mr. Emerson experienced no such diffi-

¹ Letter to Mr. Ware.

culty; his "mind was the only almighty giver"; his "thought was the universe"; and he was continually creating it for himself and his adorers. And this is called philosophy!

Emerson tells those "cultured" men and women: "If a man claims to know and speak to you of God, and carries you back to the phraseology of some old and mouldered nation in another country, in another world, believe him not." "The faith that stands on authority is no faith." "The height, the deity of man is to be self-sustained, to need no gift, no foreign force." "Free should the scholar be—free and brave." "No laws can be sacred to me but that of my nature" (*i.e.*, of the nature-god, of whom I am a part, an incarnation). "The highest virtue is always against the law." "Good and bad are but names very readily transferable to that or this; the only right is what is after my constitution; the only wrong, what is against it . . . if I am the devil's child, I will live then from the devil." "In self-trust all the virtues are comprehended." (Humility used to be looked upon as the foundation of "all the virtues.") "This one fact the world hates: that the soul *becomes*; for that forever degrades the past, turns all riches to poverty, all reputation to shame, confounds the saint with the rogue, shoves Jesus and Judas equally aside." And this is the religion, this the morality practised by the school of "culture"!

Such are the principles propounded by the "master," disguised and tricked out by the disciples in all the ornaments of a polished style, and devoured by the young and the old as polite literature. Ralph Waldo Emerson has been quoted even by prelates and divines without a word of disapproval; George Eliot has been spoken of as "the most effective preacher of morality England has seen these fifty years"; and her writings have been known to grace the shelves of a girls' library in a convent school, before their tendency was discovered.

Yet the aim of the whole school of "culture" is the same, from Matthew Arnold with his austere Atheism, down to Swinburne with his polished sensualism. One and all, they insinuate that there can be no god except nature, and that nature should be the object of supreme worship. These are the most formidable adversaries of religion and morality—far more dangerous than the infidel philosopher and scientist. Ingersoll may rave against God; Huxley may degrade man to the level of the brute. There is no charm in their blasphemies for the virtuous soul, no argument in their madness for the sound mind; and pernicious as their doctrines are, they are not apt to meet with much favor, unless they are presented under the bewitching form of literature.

II. What has been said of literature is equally true of art; because, like literature, it appeals to the sentiments, affections and

passions of the human heart. It speaks a language of its own, silent, indeed, and mysterious, but as captivating as words and often far more effective.

It is not the writer's purpose to descant upon the nature of art, upon the ideal that it must copy, or even upon the religious feeling that must underlie all true art. He does not presume to improve upon the learned lectures to which many of his readers have listened, and the able articles which they have read in the latest numbers of some of our best magazines. But taking for granted that there is no art without some ideal, without some archetype and mental model or pattern, and that religion has always furnished the highest ideals, prompted the grandest works of art, and inspired the noblest efforts of genius, he will endeavor to show that the irreligious spirit of the age has worked out its own ideals and impressed its features upon the productions of modern art.

Paganism was unable to raise art, as expressive of religious sentiment, to its highest perfection. For, if the ideal is imperfect and defective, the form under which that ideal is expressed must of necessity be imperfect and defective. Now, this ideal the Pagan artist always drew from some one of the many divinities whom he looked upon as endowed with the privilege of immortality, but in all else little better than man, subject to the same passions and animal instincts as the lowest of the human species. Nevertheless, as long as Pagan Greece had some external reverence for its gods, art flourished under the protection of religion and in return helped to keep up the semblance of religion. Olympus was not so far from the thoughts of many an honest Pagan as heaven is from the thoughts of some half-hearted, nominal Christians. God was an abiding reality for him, and false as was his conception of the divine nature, it had an effect on his daily life.

Christian art was from its nature a confession of faith. Its only study was how it might give glimpses of the spiritual world. Its very first efforts evinced the supernaturalizing influence of Christianity. Paganism had cast the gods from Olympus to surround them with the gross clog of matter; Christianity raised men towards heaven, to invest them with the ethereal subtilty of a spirit. "Those who would realize what it is to see a spirit," remarks Mrs. Jameson, "must gaze upon Fra Angelico's risen Saviour."

A high authority has expressed the same idea by saying that classicalism, or the old Greek school, believed in its gross mythology, and its works were as material as its creed; that mediævalism, or the Christian school, believed in its symbolical Christianity, and its creations were as spiritual as its faith; but that modernism, or the school of the Pagan Renaissance, believes in neither, and

its art, like its religion, is a mere negation. We need only add that, in our day, modernism in art has itself evolved into a new religion. The school of "culture" believes in nature-worship, and its productions are as sensual as nature after the fall.

Modern genius makes the mere animal representation of the "human form divine";¹ it "deifies physical loveliness"; it delights in what Matthew Arnold himself has described as "the sensuous tumult of the Renaissance"; it aims at taking the heart captive by awakening debased and prurient sentiment, and asks us to admire its works under pain of being thought "uncultured."

Now, as a well known and much esteemed non-Catholic professor wrote last fall, when the Committee of the Exposition in St. Louis had excluded certain pictures from the Gallery of Fine Art: "There should be no difference of opinion as to the impropriety of publicly displaying pictures of scenes, actions, and sentiments from which all right-minded people strive to shield their sons and daughters. . . . The canons of high art are not always to be imported from Paris. During the past summer it has been my privilege to inspect the exhibitions of living artists, not only at Paris, but in Florence, Munich, Dresden, and London, and nowhere out of Paris did I see any particularly objectionable pictures. Those in Dresden, where there were many of a high order of merit, were strikingly free from blemishes of the character we are considering."

In Paris the "cultured" artist, as well as the "littérateur," no longer hides his real motive. What William Samuel Lilly wrote of Zola, the novelist, is equally true of the cultured artist. He prides himself on knowing how to satisfy the needs of the "*bête humaine*." "Of what? does the astonished reader ask. We answer soberly, of the *bête humaine*. In Zola's view man is a beast; all men are essentially ignoble and unclean, though education may varnish them over. . . . The *New Democracy* are a collection of *bêtes humaines*, who know that they are human beasts and do not pretend to be anything else, who are well aware that the old religious conceptions which regard them as something else, are cunningly devised fables." Such is the naturalistic evolution. "The visible, when it rests not on the invisible (whether in art or in literature), becomes the bestial. . . . It leaves of him (man) nothing but the *bête humaine*, more subtle than any beast of the field, but cursed above all the beasts of the field."²

The authorities we have quoted are, we think, unexceptionable. They are intelligent, fairminded men, who know whereof they speak and are not likely to be carried away by prejudice. But as there is, perhaps, in many of us a latent disposition to identify what

¹ "Religious Feeling in Art," *Month*, for January, 1886.

² London Tablet, August 22d, 1885.

is French with what is Catholic, and to regard a disparagement of French art almost as a disparagement of Catholic morality, it will not be amiss to add the authority of the distinguished French Abbé, Joseph Roux, whose "*Pensées*," recently published in book-form, have elicited the praise even of the bitterest enemies of religion, in France and elsewhere, for their depth and their just appreciation of the subjects which he treats. Contrasting ancient Greek and modern French art, he writes: "Ancient art clothed the human body with chastity and majesty; modern art unclothes even the nude. It is an unchaste, sometimes an impudent art. Athens poured a soul over the body; Paris spreads a body over the soul. The Greek statue blushed; the French statue calls forth blushes."

The school of "culture" among us may be somewhat less shameless than in France, but its art-principles are the same. "Already," as one of our daily newspapers remarked in a well-reasoned article, last fall, "we see the effects of this bastard art in shop-windows, where paintings, engravings and photographs are occasionally displayed which, if offered for sale in small copies upon the street, might make the vender liable to arrest."¹

We may add: We see the effects in the convenient morality of some of our young art-students, who would fain have us believe that their senses are so sublimated by artistic "culture" as to receive only æsthetic impressions from beholding, studying and copying pictures or objects, "from which all right-minded people strive to shield their sons and daughters." We see the effects in the devotees of "culture," who think themselves obliged to admire everything that comes from Paris, and who take it upon themselves to interpret for us the customs and usages of polite society, to educate the public taste, and, by their example, to give a tone to the community.

III. Extravagant as these pretensions are, polite society seems disposed to regard them with some consideration. It is very yielding and susceptible to outside influences. It readily takes up new theories, and carries them out for the sake of the novelty. It dwells in a fairy-land of speculation, poetry and æstheticism, and often seems somewhat of a stranger amid the bustle and business of real life. It charms the world of imagination down to this world of action, and clothes the ideals of human thought with the tangible forms of living men and women. It acts out what it admires in literature and art. Herein lies the secret of its power over the human heart. "The heart is commonly reached," writes Cardinal Newman, "not through the reason, but through the imagination, by means of direct impressions. . . . Persons influence us, voices melt us, looks subdue us, deeds inflame us."

¹ St. Louis Republican.

Man is, by nature, a social being ; in the company of those who are on the same intellectual and social level with him, he finds his highest and purest natural pleasures. The charm of good manners, the graces of conversation, the magnetism of personal refinement exercise an indescribable fascination over us, and, if we may be permitted to apply the words of the sacred book, "draw us with the cords of Adam." When the tastes and habits of good society are correct and sound, the national life is healthy and vigorous ; when they are false and vitiated, the nation seems doomed to inevitable decay.

It is, therefore, of the highest importance to watch over the purity of social life, and not to subscribe, without much caution, to the canons or rules that govern it. Frequently these are not of our own making, any more than the fashions. We are not consulted about them ; they are imported from abroad. We are simply told to conform ourselves to them, if we wish to pass for ladies or gentlemen. And, so long as they do no violence to conscience, it may be a mark of good breeding to submit, as gracefully as we can, to their requirements, however arbitrary and unnatural they appear to us.

But, when we are called upon to believe, as Carlyle puts it, that "society is founded on cloth," to subscribe to the "divine idea of cloth," or, in the strong language of Hazlitt, to make dress almost a sacrament—"an outward sign of the inward harmony of the soul"—to hold that "manners are morals," and that "culture is religion," it behooves us, in the interest of our common manhood and womanhood, to enter a vigorous protest against such insane demands.

True, it is not pleasant to be taunted with a want of "culture." But, when "culture" means to recognize what Zola calls the "needs of the *bête humaine*," however varnished over, it is the highest refinement to escape from the contagion. Thus, Paula and Eustochion, under the guidance of Jerome, escaped from the contagion of cultured pagan society, when to mingle in its pleasures meant to offer incense upon the altar of voluptuousness. There is a higher law than that of "cultured" society—the law of right reason and of God. Whatever is not conformable to that law, how fashionable soever it may chance to be, is abominably low and coarse and vulgar.

We may apply to society the remark on art by the learned professor whom we have already quoted : "The canons of good breeding are not always to be imported from Paris." If ever there was a society which made a boast of culture and refinement, it was French society under Louis XIV. and Louis XV. To reproduce in miniature the brilliant circles that gathered at Versailles, to copy

their courtly manners, and even, we are told, to revive the names and the patterns of the costumes worn by them, is the highest ambition of the votaries of modern "culture." For the honor of our country, let us suppose that our "cultured" friends are as ignorant of the historic associations of the persons and characters of those days, as they are proud of their styles of dress and of their "culture." Polished that society undoubtedly was, which flocked to the gorgeous *fêtes* and *carousels* held under the auspices of the *grand monarque*—a very "galaxy of glory and beauty, revolving around one central figure as satellites around their sun."

But, to that bright picture there was a dark side which no art can illuminate. Those "cultured" ladies and gentlemen, though Christians in name, practised the most revolting form of nature-worship. Versailles was the shrine to which the *élite* of French society—excepting only those whom the authority of men like Fénelon preserved from the shameful idolatry—repaired to adore, and to be adored in turn. There was more ceremony there, more abject homage, than in temple of the living God. Men of the first rank deemed it a privilege to wait upon the *grand monarque*, and hand him his royal stockings; ladies made it a matter of etiquette to sacrifice their virtue to the royal pleasure. Nor were they all as penitent as the pale and pensive Louise de la Vallière—the real goddess of the gorgeous temple of nature-worship—of whom we are told that, by "her modesty and humility, in the midst of her erring triumphs (she) drew from all hearts the pardon she had never wrung from her own uncompromising conscience."¹

Louis XIV. died with ceremony; and the etiquette of "culture" and sin went on increasing, until it culminated, under his ignoble successor, in the apotheosis of the vilest passions. The pagan saturnalia were not more lascivious than the elegant receptions of the French Court. Louis XV. fell a victim to his love of "culture," and died abandoned by all save his two daughters, who had the courage to breathe the poisoned atmosphere of the royal bed-chamber; and the unutterable mass of corruption, once called a king, was hustled into a coffin, smuggled away by a few menials in the dead of night, and consigned, without ceremony or courtiers, to the ready-made grave in St. Denis. With him the *présteige*, attached to the very name of royalty in France, was buried, it would seem, to be resuscitated no more.

Would that Louis XVI. had been allowed to redeem, by his simple habits, the sinful extravagances of his predecessors, and Marie Antoinette to continue playing at shepherdess, and making the groves of Arcadia ring with her innocent peals of laughter! It was too late. The fatal handwriting was upon the wall at

¹ Catholic World, October, 1872, "Versailles."

Versailles, as it was upon the wall of Balthasar's banquet-hall; nor was there need of a Daniel to decipher its mysterious meaning. The doom was sealed; and the sentence has been executed down to our day with unrelenting rigor. The end is not yet. When shall it come? Who will dare predict? This much is evident to the impartial student of history, that excessive material civilization and luxury are responsible for the crimes and miseries which have poured, like avenging floods, over beautiful France. There is more than a chronological relation between the "culture" of Louis XIV., the blasphemies and ribaldry of Voltaire,—who was among the principal promoters of the sinful splendors of Versailles,—the ravages and indecencies of the first Revolution, the murders and sacrileges of the Commune, and the war now systematically waged against the Almighty by the infidel Republic of Grévy.

Infidelity in France is not something negative, as it often seems to be among us. It amounts to a diabolical hatred of God and of His perfections. "Écrasez l'infâme" was its watchword of old; "Dieu, c'est l'ennemi" is its watchword now. Whence the virulence which distinguishes this mental epidemic in France, and makes it so much more fatal than in other lands? To the writer it has sometimes occurred, that the answer to this question might be found in the very excellence of the gifts of nature and of grace bestowed upon that country, and wantonly abused by the representative and most favored members of society. Do not spiritual writers of the highest authority favor this explanation when they tell us, in the words of the old axiom of the schools, "Corruptio optimi pessima?" Was not Lucifer an archangel before his fall? No wonder, then, that France should be a land of violent contrasts, of strong lights and shades, of heroic virtues and revolting crimes.

But, if we ask further, wherein lies the abuse of the gifts bestowed in so eminent a degree upon France, we shall, probably, have to look for the answer in the worship of nature instead of nature's God. Infidelity among the French is not due, as much as it is among us and our Teutonic cousins, to ignorance, heresy or false philosophy. Of the average French infidel, even more than of the American, the English, or the German, it is true that he "hath said in his heart, there is no God." He is far too clear-headed to say so in his intellect. But he is very prone to say so in his heart. Unless his heart is wholly fixed upon God, it goes astray after creatures, and worships the sensible and the sensuous instead of the spiritual. Hence, to borrow a word of Matthew Arnold's,—whose authority on this subject is of some weight,—the distinguishing feature of French worldliness and false culture is "lubricity." Excepting, of course, devout French Catholics, who are often paragons of angelic purity, Venus nowhere finds more ardent adorers than among the high society of France. What the Catholic

Church and reason agree in condemning as the grossest form of immorality, is so fashionable in the highest circles of France, that, according to the testimony of one who knows, it has come to be called, by a blasphemous perversion of terms, the practice of chastity. It is only necessary to consult the comparative statistics of France and the neighboring countries, given in a recent number of the *Dublin Review*, to see, at a glance, how Heaven is punishing this infraction of its laws in the diminution of her population. Here is the explanation of the rabidness of French infidelity. As the demoniac, possessed by the demon of impurity, when he was brought face to face with Christ, so, too, French infidelity, when it is brought face to face with God, foams and froths, and goes into spasms and convulsions. "God is a spirit, and those who adore Him must adore Him in spirit."

Viewing the present distracted condition of a noble, generous and once happy people, and taught by the logic of events, one is tempted to ask—despite the many old masterpieces of literature, despite the grand monuments of ancient art, despite the high order of Christian culture found, at the present day, among the virtuous elements of French Catholic society—whether it would not be for the good of true civilization and humanity, if French literature, French art and French "culture" were swept promiscuously from the face of God's earth.

There are mothers, and fathers, too,—good, simple souls,—who wonder how it happens that their sons, though educated in Christian schools, have learned to scoff at religion; that their daughters, though nursed like tender plants, have forgotten the modesty which is supposed to distinguish Christian maidenhood. Somehow, when we hear their expressions of surprise, there come back to us, with all the force of first impressions, the words of an infidel French officer, which shocked our ears, some twelve years ago. This officer had a son, just budding into manhood, with the blush of innocence upon his cheek, with the fervor of devotion in his heart. Friends complimented the father upon the brilliant talents of his son, but hinted, at the same time, that the youth would not be likely to follow his father's example, or abandon the strict notions of religion and morality with which he had been imbued at a model Catholic boarding-school. "Oh," replied the officer, in language that shows how coarse the admirers of "culture" can be, "I will knock all that prudery and superstition out of him in two months." And how, think you, kind reader? By introducing him to the "cultured" society of Paris. We have strong reasons to fear that the father's efforts were successful.

Many Catholic children are deliberately exposed, by worldly-minded parents, to similar influences. Yet these parents complain

of the inefficiency of Catholic education to restrain the excesses of passion ; as if Catholic education meant a perpetual renewal of the miracle wrought upon the youths in the Babylonian furnace, for the special benefit of those who presumptuously throw themselves into the flames. Many children are daily taking lessons in the new school of “ culture,” and burning incense at the shrine of nature-worship. Yet their parents are astonished that the children learn these lessons. The old family Bible, that formerly lay upon the centre-table, in the sitting-room or parlor, has been replaced by one of the many editions of the new Gospel, by Zola and other prophets of “ culture ”; the rudely-carved crucifix, that stood upon the mantle, by an artistic statue of a pagan Venus or Cupid ; the sacred prints, that hung upon the wall, by a naturalistic painting of some saint or demi-god of the religion of nature-worship. Children ask what all those objects mean, from which the pure-minded man and woman of maturer years instinctively turn away their eyes ; they learn the “ needs of the *bête humaine*,” and feel the revolt of passions whose very names the young should not know nor the aged pronounce ; they practise nature-worship far more assiduously than Christianity, and understand infinitely more of the ritual of fashion than of the august ceremonial of their church.

As a consequence, religion comes to be regarded by them as a “ respectable adjunct to social usages,” consisting mainly in gentlemanly instincts, and to be practised, if practised at all, with a due regard to social “ *convenance*.” Faith is extinguished, reason clouded, conscience hardened, and all morality summed up in Diderot’s maxim, “ to follow in everything the cravings of one’s heart.” In other words, unbridled passions sway the soul, and give for moral resultant what Allie’s designates as heathenism : “ Man, as an animal, will give his body every indulgence in food and other animal pleasures which he can procure ; and, as an animal endued with mind, he will seek no less to satisfy the desires of his mind, such as consist in the cultivation of the affections, in acquiring knowledge, distinction among his fellow men, power over them, whereby he may make them the instruments of his pleasures.”

According to all sound philosophy, pagan as well as Christian, it is irrational, and, therefore, criminal, to pursue pleasure for the sake of pleasure ; because the sensible good—the *bonum delectabile*—is designed by the Creator merely as a condiment to give zest to the rational good—the *bonum honestum* ; and, consequently, a life devoted to pleasure, even if it be not sinful pleasure, deliberately frustrates the purposes of the Creator. But the worshippers of nature make as little account of philosophy and right reason as they do of faith and religion. So, far from being ashamed of their

worthless existence, they pride themselves upon it, and, perhaps, they tell you, as they have told the writer, that they wish for a life of enjoyment, short but intense. They remind you forcibly of the threat uttered by the Almighty: "My spirit shall not remain in man forever, because he is flesh." Even before the boy or girl has developed into manhood or womanhood, there is often little left but the form, the hollow shell of humanity. The eyes are without lustre, the cheeks without color, the features without expression, the words without meaning, and, we are almost tempted to say, the body without a rational soul. There is before you a wreck, an intellectual *roué*, a moral *blasé*, "lapped," as a recent writer on Christian art has expressed it, "in asphodel and moly, and making of his being an Æolian harp for the breath of sensuousness to play upon."¹

Infiltrating from the higher strata of society to the lower, the poison gradually infects every condition, and transforms the hardest races into base Sybarites, whose religion is the idolatry of the senses, whose object in life is the pursuit of animal pleasures.

This process of national deterioration is scarcely perceptible, while it is going on. It is least feared by those who are most affected by it. It is like the transition from day to night; the shadows fall upon us so stealthily, and the eye accommodates itself to the diminished light so gradually, that we are involved in darkness before we are fully aware of it. It is like the decay going on within some luscious fruit; the exterior retains its form and color, long after the canker-worm has eaten out the very heart. It is like the poisonous odors of some tropical flowers; while we are enjoying the scented essences mingled with the air we breathe, we fall into a fatal slumber, perhaps to awake no more.

Observant men of every school of thought deplore the rapid spread of luxury, and give themselves up to the gloomiest forebodings. There are Darwinians, positive in maintaining the gradual evolution of the human race from protoplasm, but equally positive in predicting its gradual deterioration until by its sensual indulgence it has worn itself out, and ends in the total extinction of the species. There are Humanitarians, who look forward with satisfaction to another deluge of barbarism that shall sweep away the effete civilization of modern Europe. There are Republicans, who rest all their hopes upon the social revolutions constantly occurring in such a state of society as ours. The vigorous elements of society, they tell us, perpetually working themselves up from below, will cast off the wasted matter from its surface, even as the agitated billows of the sea cast off the froth and scum. The hardy

¹ London Month., January, 1886, page 59.

sons of toil will displace the pampered children of luxury, and "the fittest will survive."

Whatever may be the merit of these peculiar theories, advanced by modern philosophers, they go to show, at least, this much: that the growth of luxury is something alarming to contemplate. If, now, we turn even to the most temperate writers of a very different school from those we have quoted, we shall be told that the signs of deterioration are on every side of us, even where we should least of all expect to find them. Not long ago, they remind us, there were women so prudish that they covered the legs of their pianos with pantalets, and feigned to swoon away if any one called them legs in their hearing. At present, these same women, or their daughters, imagine that they are not refined or attractive, unless they appear in society in such a condition that a man, who keeps a becoming guard over his eyes, dare not look at them; and that their conversation is not "cultured" or fascinating, unless it is racy with what they euphemistically style the "natural," but what the highest authority condemns in the strongest terms as "flesh and blood—*caro et sanguis*." They verify, literally, the words of the inspired author: they call good evil, and evil good. Their moral sense is utterly depraved. Physical cleanliness is confounded with moral purity; squalid virtue is decried as immoral, gilded luxury is extolled as highly moral. There are lower depths, into which the votaries of "culture" have fallen; but I care not to sound them to the bottom. Would that those who are gayly dancing upon the brink of the precipice, were to listen to a word of timely warning and retrace their steps! But, perhaps, this is more than we have a right to expect from them; for "the bewitching of vanity obscureth good things, and the wandering of concupiscence overturneth the innocent mind."

What aggravates the difficulty and the danger in our age is the want of definite religious principles. Without religious principles it is impossible to fix the bounds of morality, to determine when the exaggeration of seeming modesty degenerates into prudery, or the want of genuine virtue becomes lasciviousness. Without religious principles, the customs and usages of cultured society will infallibly end, as they are ending among us, in the grossest sensualism and nature-worship. The only true remedy is to be sought in the salutary restraints imposed by Christianity. As it rescued men from the barbarism of paganism, so it can rescue them from the barbarism of culture. As it reclaims individuals, so it can reclaim society. The task, we admit, is a difficult one. But Christianity has reserved forces that need only be called forth. What is wanted is united, concerted action on our part. The evils which we deplore are the direct effects, not of Atheism in the garb of science

or of rationalism in the disguise of philosophy, but of false culture in the form of literature, of art, and of society.

Men are not tempted to commit mental or moral suicide by an appeal to their reason, but by an appeal to their feelings. They do not covet evil, unless it be presented under the appearance of good. Cleopatra wished to die by the fangs of a viper concealed in a basket of roses; Heliogabalus by a sword of gold; the sentimental young maiden, of whom we read, by a goblet of poison wreathed in her intended wedding-crown. And to borrow an example from a higher authority than profane history, Eve was not tempted to eat the forbidden fruit until she had looked and seen that it was beautiful to behold. It is the fickle heart, the vagrant imagination, the truant senses, which hurry men and nations to destruction.

If, then, we desire to arrest their headlong course, we must not be satisfied with refuting the false principles of a rationalistic philosophy or the assumptions of atheistic science; we must encourage Catholic literature, cultivate Catholic art, and build up a Catholic society.

We must endeavor to make Catholic society what it was made in days past by Thomas More, the martyred premier of England, by Francis Borgia, the sainted duke of Gandia, and what it is made at the present day by those who have remained true to the traditions of the Catholic home: a school of virtue, from which we may return to the privacy of domestic life, not only more refined gentlemen and ladies, but what is infinitely more important, better men and women. This, it seems to us, is the special mission in life of educated Catholics of leisure, who realize that nothing is truly cultured, truly refined, truly æsthetic, truly beautiful, except in so far as it mirrors and reflects the infinite loveliness of God, the prototype, not only of what is true in science, but of what is beautiful in literature, in art, and in society.

THE MONKS AND CIVILIZATION.

The Monks of the West. Montalembert.

Legends of the Monastic Orders. Mrs. Jameson.

Lives of the Saints. Butler.

CIVILIZATION is the condition of man who, fallen from "original justice" and its accompanying dominion over the world, has revived in himself more or less the image and likeness of God in which Adam was created, and reasserted in a greater or less degree that control of the universe, its occupants and forces, which had been granted him from the beginning. This state implies mastery of his passions, development of those faculties which have for their object the true, the good, and the beautiful, and advance in the knowledge and direction of the elements of nature, as well as in the government of the family, the state, and the supernatural society established by the Son of God. Progress, properly so-called, must be in this direction. Hereby lie its final or motive principles.

It is not by principles that the world is moved, but rather by men who are the incarnation of those principles. All great movements are begun by extraordinary individuals, every reform needs a man for its leader, every institution, even Divine Religion itself, must have a MAN for its corner stone. "The founders of the various religious communities," says Mrs. Jameson, "were all remarkable men, and some of them were more, they were wonderful men; men of genius, of deep insight into human nature, of determined will, of large sympathies, of high aspirations, poets, who did not write poems, but acted them." Although at first the communities were exclusively of laymen, very soon many of them were elevated to the priesthood by the authorities of the Church who recognized their fitness, and innumerable bishops out of the most holy and illustrious in history sadly abandoned their aalls to wield the pastoral staff. At least forty of the Supreme Pontiffs were of the Order of St. Benedict, beginning with Gregory the Great, Apostle of England. The monkish missionaries carried the light of the Gospel into the wilds of Britain, Gaul, Saxony, Belgium, where heathenism still solemnized impure and inhuman rites, and with the Gospel carried peace and civilization, and became the refuge of the people, of the serfs, the slaves, the poor, the oppressed,

against the feudal tyrants and military despoilers of those barbarous times. "They were," says Kemble in his "Anglo Saxons," "permanent mediators between the rich and the poor, between the strong and the weak, and it must be said to their eternal honor that they understood and fulfilled in a marvellous way the duties of this noble mission."

Our own country's story gives examples of the same influence in latter days. On the bronze doors of our Capitol at Washington the figure of the monk reminds us of the part played by him in the first great enterprise of our country's discovery, and the name of the Dominican Las Casas is immortalized in the history of Columbus as that of the "friend of the weak." He exerted himself to the utmost to protect the Indians against their conquerors, made four voyages back to Spain to influence legislation in their favor, and was appointed Protector General of the Indians in America. Failing, however, he resigned his bishopric in 1551, and, retiring into his monastery, wrote two books, which he dedicated to Philip II., on the tyranny of the Spaniards in the Indies, and which, scattered among the people of the Netherlands, animated them exceedingly in their revolt against Spain.

When the discoverer of America was turning with despondent heart from the Court of Castile to seek elsewhere countenance and aid for his scheme, he, like other poor travellers, applied for hospitality at the usual place, the monastery, and telling his sublime story to a monk, Juan Prez de Machena, of the Franciscan Monastery at La Rabida in Andalusia, this one comforted his soul and interceded so effectually in his favor that Ferdinand and Isabella retained for Spain the honor she was about letting slip from her grasp, of patronizing the great sailor and winning a new world for mankind.

To come to our subject. The monks as priests were the recognized mediators between the rulers and the ruled, and while they hesitated not to resist even to death the abuse of authority, they threw the full weight of their office against the destructive spirit of revolution. Thus, while the monks in England gradually united and welded into one great kingdom the petty liberties of the country, they did not scruple to take part in those free parliaments of the nation which deposed unworthy monarchs, and so taught that people that wonderful union of law and freedom of which their constitution forms so shining an example. The preaching of the faith was usually the opening work of the monks. Following this came the establishment of the monastery, wherein the traveller, the sick, the outcast, the orphan, and the poor in general received consideration, and the heart of the people was won by practical benevolence, even before their minds could yield to the strange doctrines. The number of poor, despoiled and distressed persons

in the first ages after Benedict was very great on account of the unsettled habits of the warlike hordes of invaders, and the ruin they wrought upon the property and homes of the civilized inhabitants. These poor people in their need settled around the monasteries and were preached to, prescribed for, taught letters, trades and agriculture by the monks. As these settlements grew in stability and strength, they formed towns and built splendid Cathedrals, receiving an episcopal character on account of their importance. They copied the monastery's form of government. They united with other similarly-founded towns and met in congress, and thus consolidating their powers and uniting their forces, at last compelled all the robber-knights and feudal tyrants to submit to law and order. These monasteries being often founded, for peace and solitude's sake, in remote and waste places, of which there were vast tracts in England, it came to pass that these districts were reclaimed and made flourishing by a system of agriculture so perfect that no country can boast a better.

"Indulging and training the British spirit of freedom," says Montalembert, "the monks adapted legislation to it, and the local Parliament of England rose, grew and prospered under their care. And the like being done in every monastic establishment, unity of national sentiment also developed until the seven kingdoms were united into one in the year 827, and the English people sprang into that greatness which still endures." The Sunday-rest was most vigorously maintained in favor of the serfs, and a law is to be read whereby a slave who was compelled to work on Free-day, as it was called, became *ipso facto* a freeman. This was only one of the provisions whereby the monks hampered slavery, until it was gradually abolished. The extent to which the monks took part in the public concerns may be judged from the fact that a charter of the Parliament of 934 gives us in a list of its members: four Welsh princes, two archbishops, seventeen bishops, four abbots, twelve dukes, fifty-two thanes. It must be remarked that these prelates were nearly every one promoted from the cowl. An illustration of the humanizing influence may be noted in the penalty the Commons sometimes inflicted on some repentant robber or oppressor of the poor, which was to build a church or to grant lands for the foundation of a hospice for travellers, to build a bridge, mend a road, erect cottages for the needy. Thus his expiation itself had a civilizing effect on him, and helped to teach him wherein true manliness and nobility consisted. The first general parliament met in the cloisters of the Abbey of Westminster, and twenty-nine abbots were found in the popular branch of the government; and to this day the highest deliberative assembly in the world recalls in its meeting place the glory of those who first gave it countenance,

aid and shelter.¹ Almost all of the Prime Ministers, or Chancellors as they were called, and other leading men of England, were monks, or bishops who had been chosen from monks, and they have the main credit of building up that great monarchy. Of Thomas Becket, one of them, Chancellor under Henry II., Lord Campbell in his lives of the Chancellors, after describing in admiring and graphic language the manner of his most noble death, thus concludes :

" Thus perished, in the 53d year of his age, the man who of all the English chancellors, since the foundation of the monarchy, was of the loftiest ambition, of the greatest firmness of purpose, and the most capable of making every sacrifice to a sense of duty (or for the acquisition of renown)." " He defended the spiritual against the royal authority, and we must remember that in the 11th century the cause of the Church was in fact the cause of the weak against the strong, the cause of civilization and of the people against barbarism and tyranny, and that by his contemporaries he was regarded as the champion of the oppressed Saxon race against the Norman nobility."

What is said of England is true of many other states similarly established in order, peace, and law through monastic influence. No less than three-eighths of the cities and towns of France were founded by monks and began existence with a monastery for a nucleus ; and Guizot in his " View of the Reign of Charlemagne in the ninth Century " gives a list of the celebrated men who were in his service as ministers, councillors, secretaries ; they were all ecclesiastics of the Benedictine Order. The monks were gradually trained to the government of nations, by the protection they granted to the people who built their homes in the shadow and on the lands of the monastery. They became from landlords, temporal, and spiritual rulers, though as we have seen they endeavored to leave the temporal cares in the people's own hands, and informing them with their own spirit and methods, were the cause of the free government that flourished in the guilds, free cities and numerous republics of the Middle Ages ; while the identity of system in the various monasteries brought a likeness of custom and form amongst remote tribes, and paved the way for the national unity which exists to-day. The settlements about the monastery always flourished, for the " Curse of Rome " surrounded as with a magical circle the weak fugitives from oppression, and the " peace-compelling crozier," as Disraeli calls it, " upon contending sceptres meekly dropped." They were kind landlords, living always and spending all their income upon

¹ The monks' influence in wresting Magna Charta, the Palladium of English freedom, from King John, may be estimated from the fact that its very first clause demands the liberty of the Church : "*Imprimis volumus ut Ecclesia Dei libera sit.*"

their own estates, having no other object in view than the good of their tenants. It is good to live under the crozier,—“*Unter dem Krummstal es ist gut wohnen*,” says the grateful German proverb. Did our subject allow, we might illustrate this colonizing work of the old monks by describing the achievements of the Jesuits in Paraguay in the last century, and of the Franciscans in California in this. In this connection, however, we may just touch upon their position as almoners, something that in our present system is open to misunderstanding.

“To understand and sympathize with the importance attached to almsgiving,” says Mrs. Jameson, “we must recall a social condition very different from our own: a period when there were no poor-laws; when the laws for the protection of the lower classes were imperfect and perpetually violated: when for the wretched there was absolutely no resource but in private beneficence. The laws against debtors were then very severe, and the proximity of the Moors on one side, and the Turks on the other, rendered slavery a familiar thing. In all the maritime and commercial cities of Italy and Spain brotherhoods existed for the manumission of slaves and debtors. Charitable confraternities performed then, and in Italy perform now, many duties left to our police, or which we think we fulfil in paying our poor-rates.”

There is always left abundant opportunity for charity even in our own perhaps more advanced condition, and many brotherhoods and sisterhoods in our own times labor in divers ways for the various ills that afflict humanity. There is not and never was any form of suffering for which the Church, when free to act out her spirit, did not and cannot provide alleviation, if not remedy. “He who is ignorant of the services of the monks,” says Leibnitz, “or despises them, has only a narrow and vulgar idea of virtue, and stupidly believes that he has fulfilled all his obligations towards God by some habitual practice accomplished with that coldness which excludes zeal and love.” “I never read of a hermit,” said Samuel Johnson, “but in imagination I kiss his feet, nor of a monastery, but I fall on my knees and kiss the pavement.” Let us consider the monks’ works now more in particular, and first as to their zeal for learning.

They carried the cultivation of reason to the very highest degree, as is known to those who are acquainted with the works of Thomas of Aquin, Scotus, Albert the Great, and others who have even been reproached with excessive refinement and subtlety in their researches. “The monasteries were the sole depositaries of learning and the arts through several centuries of ignorance; the collectors and transcribers of books, when a copy of the Bible was worth a king’s ransom. Before the invention of printing every Benedictine

Abbey had its library and its scriptorium or writing-chamber, where silent monks were employed from day to day, from month to month, in making transcripts of valuable works, particularly of the Scriptures; and these were either sold for the benefit of the convent, or bestowed as precious gifts, which brought a blessing equally to those who gave and those who received. Even in the seventh century we have the authority of the venerable Bede for the fact that the Scriptures in the vernacular were then circulated through their labor, while the preservation of the remains of classical literature is entirely owing to them. Their manuscripts which we still possess are marvels of excellence and beauty."

There is in the Congressional Library an old Bible of Italian origin supposed to have been written in the thirteenth or fourteenth century. It is in Latin, upon vellum in clear bold characters extremely uniform. The writing is in two columns about three inches wide with a margin of two inches. It is embellished with 146 miniature paintings, and upwards of 1200 smaller illuminations, which are beautifully executed, and are as brilliant to-day as the day they were done. The initials of books and prologues are two and a half inches in height and those of the chapters one inch. It is contained in two large volumes, and cost the government \$2,200 gold, when gold was at a high premium, and was purchased at a sale of the library of Henry Perkins, London, in 1873. The skins in the first volume have been all repaired, except five; in the second, they are nearly all perfect. It was the sight of this relic which inspired the poet of Scribner's (November, 1881) with these verses:

" Missal of the Gothic age,
Missal with the blazoned page,
Whence, O Missal, hither come,
From what dim Scriptorium?

What the name that wrought thee thus,
Ambrose or Theophilus?
Bending thro' the waning light
O'er thy vellum scraped and white;

Weaving 'twixt thy rubric lines
Sprays and leaves and quaint designs;
Setting round thy border scrolled
Buds of purple and of gold?

Ah! A wondering brotherhood,
Doubtless, round that artist stood,
Strewing o'er his careful ways
Little choruses of praise:

Glad when his deft hand would paint
Strife of Sathanas and Saint,
Or in secret coign entwist
Jest of cloister humorist,

Well the worker earned his wage
Bending o'er the blazoned page !
Tired the hand and tired the wit
'Ere the final *explicit* !

Not as ours the books of old,
Things that steam can stamp and fold ;
Not as ours the books of yore,
Rows of type and nothing more.

Then a book was still a Book
Where a wistful man might look,
Finding something through the whole
Beating like a human soul.

In that growth of day by day,
When to labor was to pray,
Surely something vital passed
To the patient page at last :

Something that one still perceives
Vaguely present in the leaves ;
Something from the worker lent,
Something mute but eloquent."

Most of the great universities, among them Oxford and Cambridge, were founded or first served by the monks. Two Irishmen came to France in 791 and founded the great centre of learning at Paris and Pavia, while in their own country they had vast schools, conducted by the cowled heads, numbering as many as 5000 students each, and frequented by scholars from every part of Europe. Ussher, Camden, and others, are authority for the statement that Alfred the Great listened to these learned Irishmen in his projects for the advancement of literature. Butler (II. 205) tells us that the English Saxons flocked to Ireland as to the mart of sacred learning, and that this is frequently mentioned in the lives of men eminent among them. Thus, in the life of Sulgenus, in the 8th century, we read:

" Exemplo fratrum commotus amore legendi—
Ivit ad Hibernos sophia mirabili claros."
" With love of learning, and example fired,
To Ireland famed for wisdom he retired."

Camden conjectures that the English Saxons borrowed their letters from the Irish, because they used the same which the Irish at this day still make use of in writing their own language. When printing came, the monks were not slow to make use of it. The first printing press in Italy was set up at the site of St. Scholastica's Monastery, about a mile from the sacred cave of Subiaco ; the first in England was in the cloisters of the Benedictine Abbey of Westminster, and there Caxton worked at his press.

The improvement of agriculture and the reclamation of waste

lands, as well as the change which they brought about by drawing away population from the large cities, wherein the Romans were wont to concentrate wealth, enlightenment, and power, to the neglect of the country, so-called, is something for which the monks deserve the greatest praise and gratitude.

"It was," says Maitland, "as we ought most gratefully to acknowledge, a most happy thing for the world that they did not confine themselves to the possession of such small estates as they cultivated with their own hands. The extraordinary benefit which they conferred on society by colonizing waste places,—places chosen because they were waste and solitary, and such as could be reclaimed only by the incessant labor of those who were willing to work hard and live hard,—lands often given because they were not worth keeping,—lands which for a long while left their cultivators half-starved and dependent on the charity of those who admired what we must too often call fanatical zeal,—even the extraordinary benefit, I say, which they conferred on mankind by thus clearing and cultivating, was small in comparison with the advantages derived from them by society, after they had become large proprietors, landlords with more benevolence, and farmers with more intelligence and capital than any others."

"The Benedictines were the first agriculturists who brought intellectual resources, calculation, and science to bear on the cultivation of the soil; to whom we owe experimental farming and gardening, and the introduction of a variety of new vegetables, fruits, etc." Guizot styles the Benedictines *les défricheurs*, "breakers of new land;" *pioniers de l'Europe*: wherever they carried the cross they carried also the plough. The Isle of Jersey, in the Channel, was a desert when granted to the monks, who cultivated it with such skill and success that it produced the finest cattle, perhaps, in the world, and is six times as densely populated as France.

Another of their modes of proceeding may be seen from a visit to the Abbey of Mt. Mellaray, County of Waterford, in Ireland, on the desolate heights of a mountain, where the land was poor and covered with heather. They reclaimed it, planted trees, and now have a large farm and good buildings, having domestics, mechanics, and indeed all necessities for a colony in their own community. We visited their place recently, and found that they had also a boarding school with two boys from New York, and a parish school with 190 children of the poor mountaineers, whom they daily fed with their own fare, bread, milk, and vegetables. These monks have establishments in the United States, and we read that the farmers near Dubuque go to the Trappists to buy the best seed.

Of another famous Order, Mrs. Jameson thus writes: "The spare diet of the Carthusians, their rigorous seclusion, and their habits of labor, give them an emaciated look, a pale quietude, in which, however, there is no feebleness, no appearance of ill health or squalor; I never saw a Carthusian monk who did not look like a gentleman. They were the first and greatest horticulturists of Europe; of them it may be especially said that, where they settled, they 'made the desert blossom as the rose.' When they built their first nest under the heights of Chartreux, they converted the stony waste into a garden. When they were set down among the marshes of Pavia, they drained, they tilled, they planted, till the unhealthy swamp was clothed, for miles around, with beauty and fertility."

Familiarity with nature, and meditation on divine things, made the love of beauty to burn strongly in the bosoms of the monks. But it was not carnal beauty. They chose sites of remarkable attractiveness of form for their establishments, though the soil was generally barren and rocky, but devoted all their energies thereafter to making it a delightful home for the soul to rest in during her pilgrimage in this world. Their architecture was grand in the highest degree; their patronage of the fine arts could not be surpassed. Speaking of this latter, Jameson says:

"There was one vocation common to all the great religious orders. The Benedictines instituted schools of learning; the Augustinians built noble cathedrals; the mendicant orders founded hospitals; *all* became patrons of the fine arts on such a scale of magnificence that the protection of the most renowned princes has been mean and insignificant in comparison. Yet, in their relation to Art, this splendid patronage was the least of their merits. The earliest artists of the Middle Ages were the monks themselves, of the Benedictine Order. In their convents were preserved, from age to age, the traditional treatment of sacred subjects, and that pure unworldly sentiment which, in later times, was ill-exchanged for the learning of schools and the competition of academies; and as they were the only depositories of chemical and medical knowledge, and the only compounders of drugs, we owe to them also the discovery and preparation of some of the finest colors, and the invention or the improvement of the implements used in painting; for "monks not only prepared their own colors," says Eastlake, in his "History of Oil Painting," "but when they employed secular painters, in decorating their convents, the materials, furnished from their own laboratories were, consequently, of the best and most durable kind." As architects, as glass-painters, as mosaic workers, as carvers in wood and metal, they were the precursors of all that has since been achieved in Christian Art; and if so few of these admir-

able and gifted men are known to us individually and by name, it is because they work for the honor of God and their community,—not for profit nor for reputation. Theophilus, the monk, whose most curious and important treatise on the fine arts and chemistry was written in the 12th century, and lately republished in France and England, was a Benedictine. Friar Roger Bacon was a Franciscan, Albert the Great a Dominican. It is on record that the knowledge of physics attained by these two remarkable men exposed them to the charge of magic.

Munich may be almost said to-day to be the capital of the fine arts. Its name signifies the city of the monks, and doubtless their spirit it is that gives it preëminence for taste and skill.

We often find the monks giving the young painter his first start on the path of wealth and fame, for if he succeeded in one convent, his reputation and the demand for his works soon spread wherever the brethren were located.

“When Murillo returned from Madrid to his native Seville, poor and unknown, the Franciscans were the first to patronize him, and gave him the small sum one of their brothers had collected for painting their cloister; he thus laid the foundation of his fame, and afterwards, when famous, gratefully painted twenty of his finest pictures for the Franciscan Capuchins in Seville.” “The Jesuits employed Rubens and Van Dyke to decorate their splendid church at Antwerp.”

This tradition remains in Religious Orders, and to-day even in our young Republic, as well as in Canada, if you would see the finest paintings and statuary, you had better ask for the church of this or that community.

Allied to church decoration is music. Here, also, they have made the world their debtor.

The monks invented the musical system called after one of them, Pope Gregory the Great, its patron, the Gregorian Chant, which Prof. Ritter, of Vassar College, styled the very university of music, as if it contained all the art and the basis of every one of its perfect forms. Their prayer itself obliged them to be musical; for every day they had to sing the psalms in choir, and if you would know the beauty of divine worship, you must see and hear a choir of monks. Mozart is reported to have said: “I would give up all my reputation as a musician to be considered the author of the Plain Chant Preface.” The music was performed in magnificently designed and decorated churches, to many or most of which even the Cathedral of New York merely approaches in grandeur and internal beauty. Speaking of the action of Henry VIII. and his successors, Mrs. Jameson thus waxes hot and eloquent, and with reason: ‘We cannot but revolt against the rapacity of Henry VIII. and

his minions, followed afterwards by the blind fanaticism of the Puritans, which swept from the face of the land almost every memorial which was either convertible into money or within reach of the sacrilegious hand. Of Henry and his motives we can think only with disgust and horror. The Puritans were at least religiously in earnest, and if we cannot sympathize with them, we can at least understand their hatred of a faith which had filled the world with the scandal of its pernicious abuses, while the knowledge or the comprehension of all the benefits it had bestowed on our land lay beyond the mental vision of any Praise-God Barebones, or any heavenly-minded tinker or stern Covenanter of Cromwell's army. When I recall the history of the ecclesiastical potentates of Italy in the sixteenth century, I could almost turn Puritan myself; but when I think of all the wondrous and beautiful productions of human skill, all the memorials of the great and gifted men of old, the humanizers and civilizers of our country, which once existed, and of which our great cathedrals, noble and glorious as they are even now, are but the remains, it is with a very cordial hatred of the profane savage ignorance which destroyed and desecrated them."

Beauty and duration were two characteristics of their edifices, and there can be no doubt that England owes much of its conservatism, liberty, wealth, and strength, to the impression made on it by its numberless monasteries and the first-class men they produced in the spiritual and temporal orders. She has had a little more taste too in preserving at least the fair ruins of her abbeys which intensify and heighten the magical effect of "Old England," make her scenery the most lovely and delightful in Christendom, inspire her poets, architects, and landscape painters, and throw a mighty and powerful charm over the patriotic hearts of her sons. A few lines from Scott's "Marmion" may give a pleasant idea of this strength:

"The Ancient Monastery's halls,
A solemn, huge, and dark-red pile,
Placed on the margin of the isle.
In Saxon strength that Abbey frowned
With massive arches broad and round,
That rose alternate row on row,
On ponderous columns, short and low,
Built ere the art was known,
By pointed aisle and shafted stalk,
The arcades of an alley walk
To emulate in stone.
On the deep walls the heathen Dane
Had poured his impious rage in vain,
And needful was such strength to these
Exposed to the tempestuous seas,
Scourged by the winds' eternal sway,
Open to rovers fierce as they,
Which could twelve hundred years withstand
Wind, waves, and northern pirates' hand.

Not but that portion of the pile
 Rebuilt in a later style
 Showed where the spoiler's hand had been ;
 Not but the wasting sea-breeze keen
 Had worn the pillar's carving quaint,
 And mouldered in his niche the saint,
 And rounded with consuming power
 The pointed angles of each tower ;
 Yet still entire the Abbey stood
 Like veteran worn but unsubdued."

Then hear his lines on fair Melrose's beautiful window :

"The moon on the east oriel shone,
 Thro' slender shafts of shapely stone
 By foliage tracery combined ;
 Thou wouldst have thought some fairy hand,
 'Twixt poplars straight, the osier wand
 In many a freakish knot had twined,
 Then framed a spell when the work was done,
 And changed the willow-wreaths to stone !"

Leland saw the Abbey at St. Edmundsbury, built by Canute in 1020, in its splendor: "The sun hath not seen a city more finely seated, or a goodlier abbey, whether a man considers the revenues and endowments, or the largeness and incomparable magnificence thereof. A man who saw the abbey would verily say it were a city: so many gates there are in it, and some of brass, so many towers, and a most stately church, upon which attend three other churches, all of passing fine and curious workmanship." The monks are the authors of Gothic architecture. Their abbey churches are still numerous in England, the most known to fame being that at Westminster, which is a marvel in the richest and most enlightened city of the world now six hundred years after its building.¹

If architecture be a proper test of civilization, then the monks were very highly civilized indeed, and fostered this department in the most lavish and unlimited degree. Their churches are called by some one "poems, epics in stone," an open book of endless instruction and unceasing delight to all degrees of men. There is no doubt that every advancement in the greatness and beauty of public buildings, especially churches, tends to improve the

¹ Christopher Wren, the architect of St. Paul's, London, acknowledged the surpassing skill of the monkish builders. Of King's College Chapel, Cambridge, which has a groined arched roof, some of the keystones of which are estimated to weigh twenty tons each, he admitted that he could not surmise how they were laid; and at St. Michael's, Coventry, there is a spire standing on open brackets, so lofty, tapering and beautiful, that it is said he exclaimed on seeing it, "that it was hung in the air by fairies and could not have been built by mortal hands."

morals, refine the taste, and elevate the general condition of the people.

A Protestant gentleman who had finished his education in Europe and knew whence the highest training came, said to the writer that Congress should thank the builders of the New York Cathedral for that comparatively splendid achievement of æsthetic zeal and artistic culture. All Christendom should be grateful to the monks for similar and many more reasons, and all of learned Christendom is so. Omitting for brevity's sake much else that might be found detailed in the authors quoted, as well as in countless others, in praise of the old monastic institutions, let us glance at the causes of their decline and fall. Their number in England alone was very great, and their property extensive. Henry the Uxorious, eighth of the name, has the credit or the infamy of having destroyed these valuable foundations, sequestered their revenues and bestowed their lands upon his willing tools, besides scattering or putting to death many of the monks who refused to apostatize after the royal example from the faith of their and his forefathers. After all his confiscation, however, there remained for Edward VI. to suppress in his brief reign 90 colleges, 110 hospitals, besides other such places. The revenues of the monks may have amounted nominally to a fifth part of those of the nation, but considering the leases they granted upon small rents, perhaps not to a tenth. "Monasteries in England are no more," says the English Bishop Tanner, "yet justice is due to an order of men which was formerly an illustrious part of our nation, and abounded with persons eminent for both learning and piety. The veil which death casts over the ashes of great and good men is sacred, and to cast dirt upon their shrine is shocking to the most savage barbarian." Bishop Burnet says the monks were become lewd and dissolute when their order was suppressed among us. But Wharton in his "Specimen of Errors in Burnet's History of the Reformation" says: "God forbid that any professor of Christianity, much less the greatest pretenders to it, shall be guilty of such monstrous wickedness, or that any others should believe it of them without sufficient proof. Surely if the monks had been guilty of any such thing, it could not have escaped the knowledge of their visitors, who searched and divulged all their faults with the utmost industry. Nor would it have been unknown to Bale, brought up amongst them, nor omitted by him in his "English Votaries," wherein he hath set himself to defame the monastic order and the unmarried clergy with unsatiable malice." Answering Burnet's charge regarding the wealth of the monks, he says: "As for the best part of the soil being in such ill hands, and its being for the interest of the nation to have it put to better uses, this is altogether erroneous. From

the beginning to the end none ever improved their lands and possessions to better advantage than the monks, by building, cultivation, and all other methods. Of this Croyland is to this day a manifest instance. And when they leased them out to others, it was the interest of the nation to have such easy tenures continued to great numbers of persons who enjoyed them. To this it may be added that they contributed to the public charges of the nation equally with the other clergy; and the clergy did always contribute in proportion *above* the laity. So that we cannot find to what better uses these possessions have been since put," etc.

Froude himself, of the Charterhouse monks and of their prior who was put to death in Edward's reign because he would not acknowledge the royal supremacy in spirituals, thus writes: "The hospitality of the Carthusian fathers was well sustained; the charities were profuse. . . . The monks were true to their vöws, and true to their duty as far as they comprehended what duty meant. Amongst many good monks the prior, John Houghton, was the best. He was of an old English family, and had been educated at Cambridge, where he must have been a contemporary of Hugh Latimer. At the age of eight and twenty he took the vows of a monk, and had been twenty years a Carthusian at the opening of the troubles of the Reformation. John Houghton is described as small in stature, in figure graceful, in countenance dignified. In manner he was modest, in eloquence most sweet, in chastity without a stain. We may readily imagine his appearance, with that feminine austerity of expression which, it has been well said, belongs so peculiarly to the features of the mediæval ecclesiastics."

However true it be, as it is true, that characters such as here described were still to be found, and were even numerous in the monasteries, nevertheless it must be admitted, as Montalembert shows, that many abuses had crept into, or rather been forced upon, those of England as well as of France and Italy. Every human institution has within it a germ of decay, or this is of parasitical growth and is planted by the avarice and ambition of men. It is no reproach to monasticism, which ever and again springs up with renewed and purified life when relieved of its sinful embarrassments, but it is its fate, as of the Church herself, to become entangled with individuals, families, and the state. They cannot long let her alone. She is always the same, and she is immortal. She appeals to the highest motives in the heart of man, and as she is catholic in respect to providing for all his needs, her influence must ever grow, her means for doing good always extend. It is especially difficult for her to avoid becoming rich, and riches are the bane of churchmen. In their poverty lies their strength. But the ambitious and avaricious of the world cannot see with indifference

the power and wealth of the Church, and desire to possess and use for their own base, selfish purposes what should be used for that of the poor and the oppressed. Hence they try to enter the ecclesiastical career, and the worst state of things is reached when the crozier is in the hands of the worldling. The same tendency may be predicated of monasticism. The jealous nobles did not care to embrace the cowl and sandals, the abstinence and obedience themselves, so they began to assume the title without the reality, and to warp the power, riches and influence of the monasteries to their own private ends. There were other reasons also why this interference took place, which will be plain from the conclusion of the frank and eloquent author of the "*Monks of the West.*" We give the substance of his words :

"On account of the multitude of nobles who became monks and brought their estates with them, of childless knights who left them their possessions, of the great populations which grew up in the rich and fertile surroundings of the monastery, it came to pass that too large a part of the people was exempt from military service, and from all imposts except those of war, bridges and fortresses. The Venerable Bede complains already in the first century of their existence, that this was going too far, especially as some actually obtained grants and built monasteries which they filled with unfrocked monks, and, laymen as they were, married and living in luxury, called themselves Abbots and obtained exemption from military service and ordinary taxes, and these they handed down to their heirs. Afterwards kings began to give the title and revenues of monasteries to their own sons, to those of their favorites and other knaves who were mere laymen and often profligates. Thus early was begun that horrible abuse which was afterwards carried to such excess that we read of one noble youth who was Commendatory Abbot of twelve monasteries. The legitimate monks themselves also began to put on superfluous ornament, to relax discipline in various ways, as we know from the Councils of the Church in their decrees against these excesses. The very giving of alms was carried to excess, and did harm sometimes to the recipient—as well as to the donor, who seemed to imagine that he had bought liberty to sin by his generosity to the monks.

"The vast possessions of the monks, too, awakened covetousness. The heirs at law of the Abbot sometimes seized the lands after his death, under pretence that it was his property, and that they had a right to its inheritance on the sole condition of supporting the monks. Kings, too, sometimes installed themselves in a monastery for rest and recreation with a vast retinue of nobles and huntsmen, eating the fat of the land and bringing ruin to quiet, prayer, study and discipline. Often they fell in love with the place and seques-

tered it, an example frequently followed by the powerful nobles. Even the prelates themselves were carried away now and then by avarice, and made over to their relatives portions of the conventual domain. The frequent wars of civil strife and foreign conquest caused various fluctuations in the fortunes of these institutions, which, being always the best cultivated and the most populous, offered a more attractive prey. The perseverance of the monks, however, their laborious and economical system, their paternal care of the agricultural population, were almost always sufficient to restore their fortunes, and their influence and usefulness continued, more or less impaired, until the time when Henry VIII. and his immediate successors suppressed them and seized all their property. Voluntary poverty has always been the unfailing source of the influence and power of the monks. In their weakness lies their strength. Had the ecclesiastical rulers of England been careful to prevent increase of wealth, though it is impossible for a never dying society like the Church or those institutions which draw their vitality from her to avoid the occasion thereof, a vast amount of scandal, heresy and sin would have been spared Christendom."

Though often and ever suppressed and even destroyed, monasteries rise again always and speedily. The Church, like nature, soon heals her wounds and reappears after a brief winter or two as young, vigorous and fruitful as ever. Monastic institutions invariably spring up where the Church is founded. Forty years after the Revolution of '93, hundreds of them were again founded in France, to be again destroyed, to revive again. Our own young country contains several hundreds of convents of various orders already, having the same spirit as of old, but working according to the needs of the times. The advanced civilization of the nineteenth century does not need the same assistance as the rude periods which required Benedict and Francis, but in every age there is work for the monks, and every generation needs the brilliant example of the gospel virtues as shown forth in their profession and practice, their faith and works.

EDWARD HYDE AND HIS DAUGHTER.

1. *Life and Administration of Edward, First Earl of Clarendon*, with Original Correspondence and Authentic Papers. London: Thomas H. Lister.
2. *An Account of his Life*, written by himself. London.
3. *An Historical Inquiry Respecting the Character of Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon*. By the Hon. Agar Ellis. London.

"THIS I consider to be the principal use of annals, that instances of virtue may be recorded, and that by the dread of future infamy and the censures of posterity men may be deterred from depravity in word and deed. But such was the pestilential character of those times, so contaminated with adulation, that not only the first nobles, whose obnoxious splendor found protection only in obsequiousness, but all who had been consuls, a great part of such as had been prætors, and even many of the inferior senators strove for priority in the fulsomeness and extravagance of their votes. There is a tradition that Tiberius, as often as he went out of the Senate, was wont to cry out in Greek, 'How fitted for slavery are these men!' Yes, even Tiberius, the enemy of public liberty, nauseated the crouching tameness of his slaves."

THIS lesson, taught by the virtuous Tacitus in his "Annals," has often been neglected. Not always do men, even those most gifted with foresight, profit by the experiences of others even when following on the very lines that led to disaster. With the vicious it is easier to hope for impunity than to turn themselves from evil ways. That Tiberius and his minions should have cared not enough for the judgment of posterity was unfortunate, notwithstanding the doubts of that age regarding a future life. For good men, even of heathen nations, have ever been found to hope that their names and memories would live in the favorable speeches of survivors.

But what shall we think of such disregard among Christian peoples, among a people who were not only Christian, but who had taken upon themselves to reform the whole Christian Church with allegations that it had dishonored its Founder; among a people who had been unmolested in their work of reformation for one hundred and fifty years, in the last twenty of which those who had been most pronounced in their denunciations of Christian conduct of every kind, in high places after the attainment of power, had slain a wicked king, and in the commonwealth built upon his ruin made laws for the suppression of every species of iniquity, and then, as if fatigued with their own work and responsibilities, called back the exiled son of their deceased ruler with invocations of the blessings of God?

The period of the Restoration is in some respects the most interesting in British history. Indeed, in all history can hardly be found more rapid and eventful changes in some of the most important elements of a nation's being. Recalled because the people had been made sick nigh unto death under Puritan rule, without genius for empire, incapable, apparently not desirous to become a warrior or a statesman, Charles II. took the crown that had been offered to him, and entered upon a career that was singularly eventful. There was an opportunity for a most beneficent ruler if he could have been surrounded by ministers wise, patriotic, and courageous, who would have led him to endeavors to avoid the mistakes of his ancestors. With a monarch not more inclined to shed blood for the violence done to the dynasty of his family, it seems curious that obsequiousness in courtiers was as base as ever it had been under the rule of the worst Roman emperors. The House of Commons, composed mainly of Presbyterians and Independents, in a body must make haste to prostrate themselves before their gracious master, declare that words were inadequate to express their sense of the heinousness of the sins that had been committed against sacred majesty, and after obtaining forgiveness for themselves clamor for a more condign punishment than he seemed inclined to inflict upon others who had been as guilty, but less abject.

The Prime Minister was a man formed by nature for a noble work. In different circumstances he might have achieved what would have made him be numbered among the greatest statesmen. First an opposer of the most arbitrary measures of Charles I., having joined in the impeachment of the Earl of Strafford, he turned at length from the violent party of the people, followed into exile the son, was his chief counsellor during that period, returned with him when called back to his father's throne, and led the administration until his ungrateful master gave him up to the clamors of new favorites and drove him into a second exile wherein he was to die. During this last period he got what solace was possible in writing his "History of the Great Rebellion" and the "Account of His Own Life." The latter work we propose now to consider briefly, particularly the part referring to the marriage of his daughter Anne.

Behavior like that of which Edward Hyde, then Lord Clarendon, wrote with his own hand it would not be easy to find in the biography of any parent, at least one approximating his rank. Whoever reads of this, as well in the father's own "Account," as in the concurrent memoirs of those times, must have, we should suppose, opinions concerning King James II. somewhat different from those generally held. If the father of Anne Hyde was not sincere

in the feeling he expressed on first hearing of the connection between her and the Duke of York, his utterances were sufficiently base. If he was sincere, it would be hardly more than justice to characterize him as the most shamelessly unnatural of all fathers of whom history has transmitted account.

There is something in feminine honor that ever has seemed to call from the male sex an amount of tender respect, and of the taking of risks for its defence, that are required by no other human condition. Particularly has this been the case with maidens. The dishonor of wives, indeed, has always been regarded with horror, but to all manful minds that of daughters has seemed yet more appalling. Mankind praised the high-born Lucretia for the revenge she took for enduring the insult of Tarquinius; but higher was the laudation of the humble centurion who, by making himself childless, saved his daughter from outrage by the proud Decemvir. The world holds in scorn the husband who condones the ruin of his wife; but there is no depth to its detestation of the parent who tolerates, much less connives at, that of his daughter. We are now contemplating, it is true, a period wherein social and domestic virtues, especially among the highest circles, were as low, or almost as low, as they have ever been among any people of whom we have published accounts. Yet among all the evil examples which that notable period has transmitted, the case of Anne Hyde to us appears the worst.

In order to mitigate as much as possible her father's conduct, and bring it to that degree wherein it may seem the conduct at least of a human being, not of a devil, we must assume (what indeed is most probable) that the father was acting throughout a part of unmixed duplicity, and that the last results, though following so contrary to his counsels and pretended wishes, were such as he had long premeditated and eagerly hoped to see attained. Such assumptions must be taken and allowed sometimes in order to make certain things credible. For there be some things, as Horace warned the young Pisos, that are so monstrous that a person of ordinary virtue and credulity cannot forbear, while listening to their recital, to exclaim, "*INCREDULUS ODI!*"

Yet, let it be remarked that this assumption is taken in spite of the fact that the "Account" was drawn up ten years after the occurrences described, and while the father was languishing in exile in a foreign country.

There is much in the first appointment of Anne Hyde in the household of the Princess of Orange that "sounds of fraud." To the suggestion of O'Neil that he should apply in her behalf for the place, "Hyde answered" (as said in the "Account") "that he had but one daughter, who was all the comfort and company

her mother had in her melancholic retirement, and therefore he was resolved not to separate them, nor to dispose his daughter to a court life." Yet, when the family-friend's interest had prevailed, and an offer was made by the Princess and the King, her brother, the father, though still professing disinclination, left the decision to the mother, who quickly enough accepted.

A father apprehensive of the influence of court life upon an only daughter soon had reason to feel more so from the praise everywhere bestowed upon her. In a few months after her appointment the Queen of Bohemia wrote:

"We had a Royaltie, though not upon twelf night, at Teiling. Mrs. Hide was a shepherdess, and I assure you was verie handsome in it. None but her mistress looked better than she did. I believe my Lady Hide and the Chancellour will not be sorie to heare it." And afterwards: "I pray remember me to Mr. Chancellour, and tell him his ladie and my favorit, his daughter, came hither upon Saturday, and are gone this day to Teiling. I finde my favorit grown everie way to her advantage."

In spite of anxieties which must have been sharpened by such glowing accounts of the gifts of the new maid of honor in public impersonations of poetic characters, there seemed never to have been as much as a thought of withdrawing her, and she was suffered to continue "grown everie way to her advantage."

Anne Hyde was not a beauty; but she had the understanding, culture, and manners that often captivate more than beauty of person. These, on the occasion of a visit paid by the Princess to the Queen mother at Paris, attracted the Duke of York, to whose suit she lent a willing, but entirely honorable consent, and, upon the return to Breda, signed with him a contract of marriage which after the Restoration was secretly ratified at Worcester House, her father's residence, the bride having been given away by the Lord Ossory. Some circumstances there were, not necessary to be mentioned here, that would seem to have made it impossible for the Chancellor not to know the relations of Anne to the Duke.¹

¹ Things far less significant than many which must have come constantly within the Chancellor's observation had raised suspicion outside of his family. In Locke's "Memoirs of Lord Shaftsbury" occurs the following: "Soon after the Restoration of King Charles II., the Earl of Southampton and Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, having dined together at the Chancellor's, as they were returning home, Sir A. said to my Lord Southampton, 'Yonder Mrs. Anne Hyde is certainly married to one of the 'Brothers.'" The Earl, who was a friend to the Chancellor, treated this as a chimera, and asked him how so wild a fancy could get into his head. 'Assure yourself' (replied he) 'it is so. A concealed respect (however suppressed) showed itself so plainly in the looks, voice, and manner wherewith her mother carved to her, or offered her of every dish, that it is impossible but it must be so.' My Lord S., who thought it a groundless conceit then, was not long after convinced, by the Duke of York's owning of her, that Lord Ashley was no bad guesser."

However, we shall see how he admits to have behaved when the latter demanded of his brother the right to publish his marriage, and the Chancellor, Lords Ormond and Southampton had been summoned for consultation touching the demand. It would be not easy, we believe, to match the following extracts from an autobiography:

“The first matter of general and public importance, and which resulted not from any debate in Parliament, was the discovery of a great affection the Duke had for the Chancellor's daughter, who was a maid of honor to the King's sister, the Princess Royal of Orange, and of a contract of marriage between them, with which nobody was so surprised and confounded as the Chancellor himself, who, being of a nature far from jealousy and very confident of an entire affection and obedience from all his children, and particularly from that daughter whom he had loved dearly, never had in the least degree suspected any such thing, though he knew afterwards that the Duke's affection and kindness had been much spoken of beyond seas, but without the least suspicion in any body that it could ever tend to marriage. . . . But now upon this discovery and the consequence thereof, he looked upon himself as a ruined person, and that the King's indignation ought to fall upon him as the contriver of that indignity to the crown, which on himself from his soul he abhorred, and would have had the presumption of his daughter punished with the utmost severity, so he believed the whole kingdom would be influenced by the punishment of it and to prevent the dishonor which might result from it. And the least calamity that he expected upon himself and his family, how innocent soever, was an everlasting banishment out of the kingdom and to end his days in foreign parts in poverty and misery. . . .

“The manner of the Chancellor receiving this advertisement made it evident enough that he was struck with it to the heart, and had never had the least jealousy or apprehension of it. He broke out into a very immoderate passion at the wickedness of his daughter, and said with all imaginable earnestness that as soon as he came home he would turn her out of his house as——”

But some of his words were too shocking to be transcribed upon a clean page. The other lords in council, it seems, endeavored to mitigate somewhat this mighty indignation, and called his attention to the fact that the Duke had admitted the marriage, and that the business in hand was not for devising how the marriage might be prevented, but of what was to be done in existing circumstances. The monstrosity of such a *mesalliance* on honorable terms at first had seemed incredible to the outraged parent, who, we must conclude from his own words, could easily bear that the grandson who was shortly to appear should come with the mark of in-

effaceable infamy upon his innocent front, but not that one so low-born should enter among the possibilities of an eventual wearing of the crown. When the awful fact of marriage was mentioned, what must he do? He told what he did, and he told it long afterwards when himself was an exile, and that same daughter was in the enjoyment of wifedom and motherhood obtained by faithful compliance with every behest of honor and religion.

"Whereupon he fell into new commotions and said, if that were true, he were well prepared to advise what was to be done."

It makes one shudder to read what he says as to what in this daughter's case he would prefer than for that mighty dynasty to be dishonored and endangered by a public acknowledgment of such a marriage. Any disgrace upon himself and his family he could endure, but none inflicted upon those in whom was the divine right. "The indignity to himself he would submit to the good pleasure of God. But if there were any reason to suspect the other, he was ready to give a positive judgment in which he hoped their lordships would concur with him, that the King should immediately cause the woman to be sent to the Tower, and to be cast into a dungeon under so strict a guard that no person living should be permitted to come to her; and then that an act of Parliament should be immediately passed for the cutting off her head, to which he would not only give his consent, but would be very willingly the first man that should propose it. And whoso knew the man will believe that he said this very heartily. . . . I had rather submit and bear this disgrace with all humility than that it should be repaired by making her his wife, the thought whereof I do so much abominate that I had rather see her dead with all the infamy that is due to her presumption."

Even the consoling words of the king, which could not be restrained at sight of the injured father's "swollen eyes from whence a flood of tears were fallen," were answered with chidings for his too great clemency.

"Your Majesty is too easy and gentle a nature, to contend with those rough affronts which the iniquity and license of the late times is like to put upon you before it be subdued and reformed."

We will believe, for the honor of fatherhood, that these horribly unnatural words, and others worse which we cannot transcribe, were, simply, the grossest lies, uttered for the purpose of hiding his joy at the consummation of hopes that were the fondest he had ever indulged. It must have been gratifying to the family and friends that, not long afterwards, the sorrowful wailer was able to lift his head, if only a trifle, when the king put into his hands, privately, a gift of twenty thousand pounds.

"This bounty, flowing from the king at such a melancholic

juncture, and of which nobody could have notice, could not but raise the spirits of the Chancellor."

If ever a man was sorely tempted to use the opportunities extended for putting away his wife, it surely was the Duke of York. The repugnance of the king, that, more trying still, of the Princess of Orange and the Queen mother, the condemnation of Hyde by his enemies in spite of his disclaiming of complicity, above all, the audacious plot of Sir George Berkeley, his master of horse, with Jermyn, Talbot, Killigrew, and Lord Arran, to disgust him by blackening his wife's name with charges of familiarities of which themselves had been recipients,—all these shook his resolution; but only for a brief time. To the good fortune of the innocent woman, the man by whom she had been espoused, whatever were his infirmities, and however he may have been supposed to tire of her society, was of a religious faith that held the marriage bond to be indissoluble, except by the act of God. Fortunate, also, it was that the stories of her infidelities were told with circumstantialities so manifestly absurd that they were obliged to be discredited. For a time, indeed, the duke was perplexed in the extreme by painful doubts. For a husband, if he doubts, or if, to his knowledge, others doubt of the honor that is most precious to him, suffers as a manful spirit can suffer from no other cause. But his incertitude happily was of brief duration. The very grossness of the charges dispelled all suspicion, and the sooner brought about the public acknowledgment, every day's delay of which added to the injuries of a woman whose innocence was her only possession that had made her capable to endure them.

A graphic account was given of this by the Duc de Grammont, in his "*Memoires*." With the pleasantry of a looker-on at events which only amused him, he speaks of the accusers as "*tous gens d'honneur, mais qui préféroient infiniment celui du Duc de York à celui de Mademoiselle Hyde*." After reciting the foul calumnies, and the summons, almost immediately after this utterance, received by Lord Ossory and Sir George Berkeley to attend the Duke at the residence of the Lord Chancellor, he thus concludes:

"*Ils trouvèrent à leur marquée son Altesse dans la chambre de Mademoiselle Hyde, ses yeux paroissent mouillés de quelques larmes qu'elle s'efforçoit de retenir. Le Chancelier, appuyé contre la muraille, leur parut bouffi de quelque chose. Ils ne doutèrent point que ce ne fût de rage et de désespoir. Ex Le Duc d'York leur dit, de cet air content et serein dont on annonce les bonnes nouvelles, 'Commes vous êtes les deux hommes de la Cour que j'estime le plus, je veux que vous ayez les premières l'honneur de saluer la Duchesse d'York. La voila.'*"

Small place, either in histories or contemporary memoirs, was

given to the young woman who had been so sorely tried. That she suffered keenly, we cannot doubt. For there are some injuries that, upon the innocent, inflict anguish that the guilty never feel, even under the hardest blows. Yet, in the midst of her sorrow in secret silence, the hope must have been strong in her breast that the deliverance she prayed for would come in the good time of God. Not yet being, not yet daring to be, a Catholic herself, she yet could not fail to know the solemn, the awful inviolability in which the Church of her husband held the bond of marriage. In the inconstancy of his sex, in the fears concerning her honor by which he had been racked, he might suffer her to fall a victim under the act which her unnatural father was ready to propose in Parliament; but she knew that she could never be a repudiated wife of him to whom she had given her entire self; and so she waited with the patience by which Heaven supports the pure in heart, whom, with purposes wise and merciful, it sometimes allows to be afflicted and persecuted.

Her behavior, after this public recognition, was like what we have read in the lives of saints, and nowhere else. Forgiveness is a solemn duty, and when practised without grudge or reservation, a great virtue. But there was something almost more than human in that extended to those false witnesses by the woman whom they had so foully wronged. At least, it went to the extremest human possibilities, not only when they were all forgiven by the husband and the wife, but when the wife bestowed praise upon conduct which, as she graciously said, had been acted solely in the cause of the safety of her dearest lord. For the knight, Sir George Berkeley, destined for yet higher honors, had so pleaded in justification of his confessed perjuries.

There can be little doubt that these assertions of Chancellor Hyde about his preferring the death and disgrace of his only daughter to her becoming the acknowledged wife of the Duke of York, were wholly false. Their sincerity would have been monstrous, even if his fears of the ruin that the marriage would bring upon himself had been well founded. There might have been something, we must hope there was, in a father's instinct to shield his offspring from threatened condign punishment by himself taking the lead in damnatory epithets to a degree that sometimes diverts the vengeance in pursuit and leaves open a way for pity towards a victim so entirely friendless. But such conduct, pardonable in some cases, was wholly unnecessary in the case of one who knew, as this man must have known, the extent of his power and influence. This is apparent from what he wrote of the hostility of the Queen mother to the match, so fiercely pronounced at first, but destined soon to subside into a most proper motherly affec-

tion. There is much sarcasm, covert as it tried to keep itself, in rehearsing the speech of the Queen, who, in hot haste, had come over from Paris, to put her foot upon the nefarious alliance, that "whenever that woman should be brought into Whitehall by one door, her majesty would go out of it at another door, and never come into it again," and how, afterwards, she received from Cardinal Mazarin a significant warning, "that she would not receive a good welcome in France if she left her sons in her displeasure, and professed an animosity against those ministers who were most trusted by the king." This intimation, in briefest time, wrought a change in the bearing of the offended Henrietta Maria. On the day before that set for her return, the Duke presented his wife, when, as reported by the gossipy Pepys, "the Queen is said to receive her now with much respect and love."

The duplicity of the great minister appears to have been chronic. He was yet only Chancellor Hyde. The King had several times proposed a peerage, telling him, as he says, "he was assured by many of the lords that it was most necessary for his service in the Parliament." Eagerly as he desired this honor, his instinctive caution made him decline then; but he gave his promise that he would accept at some future time, a promise that he faithfully kept.

The bride who, through so many difficulties, had risen so high, was destined to bear many children, to see four of them die in childhood, to meet an early death herself. Doubtless she never so much as dreamed that two of her surviving offspring would succeed their father on the English throne. It seemed like one of the dispositions of Nemesis, that when the last of these should de cease, those of her high-born successor should see the diadem revert through two generations to a kinsman not only distant, but a foreigner.

From the time of his daughter's marriage the rise of Hyde was rapid. Under a virtuous and courageous sovereign such a minister could have done well for his country. His tastes and his feelings were sincerely against the disgusting immoralities of the court and the age. It must have been painful to him very often to feel obliged to connive at actions that shocked his moral sense; yet he was too fond of power even to insist upon those which would have been for the honor and glory of the nation. He could not but have foreseen how that first secret borrowing of money from the French monarch would result in a dependency that would forever disgrace a reign in which, next to the sovereign, he was enacting the leading part. Then not only his moral sense, but that of his manhood, must have revolted at the brutalities inflicted upon the unhappy Catharine of Braganza from the very beginning to the

very end of her married life. He did, indeed, feebly remonstrate against the King's action in making the infamous Lady Castlemaine a maid of the bedchamber of the pious woman whom he had lately married. Of her, shortly after his marriage, the King had written thus, after much indelicate but hearty praise of her personal attractiveness: "I thinke myself very happy, for I am confident our two humours will agree very well together," and "I cannot easily tell you how happy I thinke myself; and I must be the worst man living (which I hope I am not) if I be not a good husband." Yet one month was sufficient to cloy him who had no relish for happiness honorably obtained. Let us see how he can write after one month to the minister who had humbly counselled against the course he had already shown his intention to pursue.

"I forgott when you were heere last, to desire you to give Brodericke¹ good counsell not to meddle any more with what concerns my Lady Castlemaine, and to let him have a care how he is the authorre of any scandalous reports; for if I finde him guilty of any such thing, I will make him repent it to the last moment of his life. And now I am entered on this matter, I thinke it very necessary to give you a little good counsell in it, least you may thinke that by making a further stirr in the business you may divert me from my resolution, which all the world shall never do; and I wish I may be unhappy in this world and in the world to come, if I faile in the least degree what I have resolved; which is of making my Lady Castlemaine of my wives bedchamber; and whosoever I finde use any endeavour to hinder this resolution of myne (except it be only to myselfe), I will be his enemy to the last moment of my life. You know what a true friende I have been to you. If you will oblige me eternally, make this business as easy as you can of what opinion soever you are of; for I am resolved to go through with this matter lett what will come on it; which againe I solemnly sweare before Almighty God. Therefore, if you desire to have the continuance of my friendship, meddle no more with this businesse excepte it be to beare down all false and scandalous reports, and to facilitate what I am sure my honour is so much concerned in; and whosoever I finde to be my Lady Castlemaine's enemy in this matter, I do promise upon my word, to be his enemy as long as I live. You may show this letter to my Ld. Lt., and if you have both a minde to oblige me cary yourselves like friends to me in this matter,

CHARLES R."

If the limits of a review article would allow such a diversion, we should like to notice, if only in brief, the career of that poor queen; how her attendants that had followed her from Portugal were one by one driven from her service; how her sense of wifehood at first revolted at the relations with Lady Castlemaine proposed by her husband, and she was forced to yield to the Chancellor's entreaties which his base servility made him employ;² how

¹ Sir Alan Broderick, Com. of Irish Affairs and M.P. for Dungarvan.

² In his "Account" he writes how with the King he urged "the hard-heartedness and cruelty in laying such a command upon the Queen which flesh and blood could not comply with;" how his course had already "lost him some ground," and how its continuance "would break the hearts of all his friends, and be only grateful to those

her submission made her no new friends, but lost to her some of her old ; how she was rescued from the criminations of Oates, yet with no more feeling than would have been bestowed upon the lowest woman of England who was known to be guiltless. It might be interesting to follow the Lady Castlemaine, now become Duchess of Cleveland, in her ons and offs with her royal lover, in her persistent and finally successful endeavors to ruin the Lord Chancellor after the sale of Dunkirk and the disasters of a war against the undertaking of which he had striven in vain. But we must make an end with that of the statesman whom we have been considering. He died hard. Beyond measure it surprised and pained him that his servile compliances with things which his judgment and his conscience alike had condemned, had lost for him both the confidence of the people and the friendship of the court. It was pitiful to see how tenaciously he clung to power, even after he must have known that his hold upon it was forever broken, how he resisted every intimation to resign, how anguishingly he received the orders for his disgrace, and how in his exile he was ever praying and hoping for pardon and permission to return. Among the very last letters written by him were those addressed to his daughter and his son-in-law regarding the reports of her conversion to the Roman Catholic faith. In these was shown his accurate knowledge of the temper of the English nation upon this subject. After some discussion of the theological points, he insinuated a caution which, had James been a more politic man, might have been otherwise heeded, that if the reported defection from the English Church were true, "it might very probably raise a greater storm against the Roman Catholics in general than modest men can wish." Even in banishment he seemed to hold to the idea that action in matters of most vital importance should be determined upon with views of personal security. His remonstrances had no effect. His daughter died in the consolations of that faith from which, in the want of maternal guidance, her surviving daughters were destined to become estranged.

There is much pathos in the last appeal made by Clarendon a few months before his death at Rouen. In June (1671) he had written to the King and entreated "that an old man who had

who wished for the destruction of monarchy." Yet in a month after this he writes thus to the Duke of Ormond: "I have likewise twice spoken with the Queene. The Lady hath beene at Courte, and kissed her hande, and returned that night. I cannot tell you ther was no discomposure. I am not out of hope, and that is all I can yett say. I shall send this by Sr All. Brodericke, and so shall not neede to use cypher; but hereafter I shall always use cypher upon this argument, and I believe rarely upon any other; and therefore you must take the paynes still to dischyfer yourselfe."

served the Crown above thirty years in some trust and in some acceptance, might be allowed to end his days in the society of his children," and in the hope that so humble a petition would not be refused, he had begun to give directions for some changes and repairs of his former country estate. No answer being received, he wrote again in August. "Seven years," he said, "was a time prescribed and limited by God himself for the extirpation of some of his greatest judgments ; and it is full that time since I have, with all possible humility, sustained the insupportable weight of the King's displeasure. Since it will be in nobody's power long to keep me from dying, methinks the desiring a place to die in should not be thought a great presumption, nor unreasonable for me to beg leave to die in my own country and among my own children." No attention was given this last appeal, and three months afterwards he died in that country in which he had spent so many years in a former exile, and to which he had not even endeavored to save his own from paying dishonorable tribute. To the gratitude which he so humbly prayed to be paid for long, laborious, patient services, many of which had been rendered in pandering to gratifications not only unworthy of a king, but most unmanly and vicious, it must have been anguishing to feel, if he did feel, that he was not entitled. Little affection appears to have been between him and his son-in-law. Probable it is that the latter felt and exhibited contempt for his want of sincerity and courage, qualities that, however they may have been ignored by some historians, this last of the Stuart kings had to a higher degree than any of the rest of that house.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN ART.

The History of Christian Art, in the First Eight Centuries of the Church.

By Fr. Raffaele Garrucci, S. J. Illustrating all the Monuments of Painting and Sculpture; with Five Hundred Full Page Plates, Engraved on Brass. In Six Folio Volumes.

SO reads the title-page of the beautiful and valuable work of Fr. Garrucci. Such a work as this, the result of twenty-six years of toil, one does not see often in a century, and it is a reminder that, amid the torrent of quickly written, cheaply sold, and quickly forgotten books, the age of truly great works has not yet passed away. A glance at the author's life and work, and at the circumstances which led to its production, will be of value to thoughtful minds.

A notice of the death of Father Garrucci in the *American Journal of Archæology* says: "He was one of the most learned archæologists of Italy, and especially in the branch of iconography, and devoted himself almost entirely to the study of early Christian art. His numerous writings extend over a period of thirty-five years, and comprise his collections of early Latin inscriptions, his *Vetri Ornati di Figure in Oro* (1858), his monograph on the *Jewish Cemetery of the Via Appia*, and finally his great work, *Storia dell' Arte Christiana nei primi otto secoli della Chiesa* (1872-1882), in which he has illustrated, in six folio volumes of text and plates, every known work produced by the Christian art of the first eight centuries. . . . Shortly before his death he had completed a colossal work, which is soon to be published, on the history of Italian coinage from the origin of the '*aes rude*' down to the present time."

His recent death deprives the world of a learned and unwearied worker, but his name must remain forever linked to the history of Christian art. Fr. Garrucci was born in Naples on January 23d, 1812, entered the Society of Jesus at the age of fourteen in 1826, and at the age of seventy-three, on May 5th, 1885, the very day when his hand had corrected the last page of proof of his colossal work on Numismatics, death put an end to his labors.

His training and gradual development were eminently adapted to the great work to which he devoted his life. After several years spent in teaching literature, and pursuing those studies which started him on his career as an able theologian, he applied himself exclusively to the study of sacred and profane antiquities.

He soon became universally esteemed for his erudition and philological acquirements, and especially for his skill in the interpretation of emblems, Hebrew, Egyptian, Phœnician, Etruscan, as well as of those of Greece and Rome.

His experience in paleography and art were such that from partial fragments he was able to restore the inscriptions. Years afterwards, when the missing portions were brought to light, the actual readings verified the approximate ones previously given by Fr. Garrucci. To decide the origin, epoch, or country of a parchment or a monument, a short examination was sufficient, and on such points his judgments were sought for by professional men and accepted as of the highest value.

It was after he had spent twenty years in the study of antiquities, reading and annotating all the Oriental, Greek, and Latin Fathers, and making himself familiar with the museums and collections of art, public and private, throughout Europe, that he felt himself prepared to begin his great work.

Among his earlier productions were the Illustrations of the Lateran Museum; the Graphites or Tracings of Pompeii, of Rome; the Inscriptions of Salerno, Benevento, Pozzuoli, Pietri; the Ancient Geography of Italy, the Museum of Campagna, the Oscan Tongue, the Grammar and Dictionary of its Inscriptions, besides papers on archæology without number, published in various reviews, or read before the different academies of which he was a member.

At present our attention must be limited to the work mentioned above, wherein it may be said in truth that the author has created the theory of Christian art.

The first volume of the work explains the theory in six parts. 1. Art; 2. Man; 3. Symbols; 4. Personification; 5. Types of the Old Testament; 6. Types of the New Testament. The history embraces Christian art in its origin and progress from the first to the eighth century.

The remaining five volumes include the illustrations of many thousands of subjects, together with the explanations and proofs, from various writers, of their symbolic meaning. In the second volume are the paintings from cemeteries; in the third, those from basilicas, codices, sacred ornaments, glass engraved on gold ground, etc.; in the fourth, mosaics; in the fifth, sarcophagi; and in the sixth, designs on gold, silver, bronze, ivory, marble, glass, lead, coins, seals, and precious stones. The trustworthiness of these illustrations may be gathered from the fact that the plates are from copies made by the author from the original monuments in the cases where these monuments were still in existence. To procure the most perfect results no labor or expense has been

spared, and all the resources of modern times, photography, artificial illumination, skilled draughtsmen, have contributed to the reproduction of these monuments.

The first idea of writing the History of Christian Art was conceived in 1856. Fr. Martin, of Paris, the celebrated author of the *Vitreux de Bourges*, was about to publish a translation of Buonarroti's *Vitra Cemeterialia*, and anxious to have the help of so experienced an archæologist as Fr. Garrucci, invited his aid in the work. Fr. Garrucci called his attention to the fact that, besides the work of Buonarroti, there were many other *Vitra* yet unpublished; moreover, some of the copies of Buonarroti were not exact, others were copies of counterfeits. Why should not Fr. Martin make a complete publication of his own? On reflection, Fr. Martin concluded to examine all existing specimens and to publish only those whose genuineness and accuracy he had tested by personal experience. Soon this first idea was enlarged, and Fr. Garrucci proposed to Fr. Martin his own plan of embracing in their work not only the *glass collections*, but all the monuments of Christian art. The plan was accepted, developed, and matured, and they started out on their career of exploration, examination, and labor together. Both Fr. Martin and Fr. Garrucci were excellent draughtsmen, and with a third experienced hand the work went forward vigorously for three years. In order to copy specimens, it was often necessary to erect scaffoldings at great danger and enormous expense, and during one of the most daring of these enterprises, while copying a mosaic from the ceiling of a cupola at Ravenna, sudden death seized upon Fr. Martin, and Fr. Garrucci was left to carry on the tremendous work alone.

After fifteen years spent in writing, and in gathering these monuments, and preparing his theory, Fr. Garrucci began the publication of his work in 1872. In 1882 it was completed. Ten years may seem a long time for the publication of a single work, but when we consider that in five of the folio volumes every second page is a full page engraving, some containing three, ten, or twenty different figures, the wonder ceases.

Besides the Christian monuments, Fr. Garrucci has given an ample collection of the monuments of the Jews and of non-Catholic art in two separate treatises. An appendix treats of monuments counterfeited by famous impostors. The cemeteries whose paintings are given in the History of Christian Art are the following: all the cemeteries of Rome and Naples; a cemetery of Syracuse, Milan, Rheims, Alexandria in Egypt, Cyrene, and Cyrenic Lybia.

We shall now pass to the examination of the nature of Christian art itself. Art, as such, and Christian art are two different things. A fine art, it is said, aims at the representation of the beautiful.

But Christian art cannot stop here, and rest in the mere representation of what may please the eye. It is inseparable from intellectual and moral good. It lives in a sphere above the sensual, and while it does not reject the materially beautiful, this last must be altogether subordinate to the intellectual and moral good to be derived from the work, as well as to the special end which Christian art has in view. This end is to bring before the mind of man the dogmas and teachings of the Church, as well by the avenues of vision as by those of hearing, through which, says St. Paul, "Faith cometh." Outline, form, color, must all be subject to this end.

Christian art does not mean merely the work of a Christian. Artistic results produced by a brush in the hands of a Christian can no more be styled Christian art, than the "Imitation of Christ" printed by a Protestant, could be called a Protestant book. Christian art means the use of the art of design to teach Catholic dogma, or to suggest the mysteries of the Catholic religion. For Christian art, in the early centuries, was Catholic art, and to-day there can be no true Christian art which is not, at the same time, Catholic art. In the early Christian art of the Church, the elements of form, color, outline, were employed only in so far as they were a mode of conveying the meaning of some mystery or truth of religion, whereas, in modern art, a widely existing complaint is that in many paintings where outline, form, and color are next to faultless, the work itself is devoid of spiritual or intellectual meaning, and too often is utterly innocent of any meaning at all.

It is worth our while here to examine briefly the ideas of our illustrious author on the nature of Christian art. Man may communicate his ideas by means of signs or images impressed on matter. Thus, for instance, alphabetic writing transmits ideas without representing them. Whereas, the art of painting not only transmits the idea, but represents it; and if this is done according to certain rules we call it art. Therefore, the art of design, or painting, is the faculty of communicating ideas by means of images drawn or painted according to fixed rules.

This communication is made by a human act, and, consequently, is inseparable from moral good or evil, according as the idea is or is not conformed to intellectual truth and moral good.

What do we mean by beautiful? Beautiful is the name given to a work of art that represents, truthfully, a concept of the mind and is pleasing to the senses. The *ideal* of the beautiful, or the æsthetically beautiful, cannot be limited to the materiality of the image. For that cannot be called wholly beautiful which is at variance with truth, even though it have in the highest degree all the perfection that can please the senses.

The end aimed at by Pagan society in its art was to represent the most perfect beauty, in the proportion of limbs and in the grace of attitude, portrayed to express the passions of the soul. But that which could appear beautiful to their pagan eyes, cannot appear so to ours, for whom the ideal of the beautiful must be, as a first requisite, intellectual and moral. The end of the Church, in her art, could not be merely to please the eye by sensible beauty, or to arouse animal passion, which naturally tends to what the eye represents as suited to its appetite. She ordained art to a most noble end, one in harmony with her divine institution, the constant and vivid remembrance of revealed truth, and the stirring of the will to reach that last end proposed to conscious intelligence. By means of visible pictures she calls to mind the reality of the invisible world, and strives to keep its image ever before the windows of the soul.

To seek only the æsthetics of the human form in Christian art, would be as far out of place as to look for the same in Egyptian hieroglyphics, which were intended to express not beautiful and perfect figures, but a meaning, through the use of action and signs. Art, at times, forgot the reason of its being.

For must it not be conceded that at the *Renaissance* art became, in a certain sense, Pagan? In general, little was appreciated or sought for save beauty and grace of design; and in the exhibition of this, but small heed was given to what was becoming or to the reverence due religion. And the beholders, in consequence, far from being reminded of holy mysteries, were moved to idle thoughts, to speak of nothing worse.

For this reason, we see the want of logic in those who blame the early Church because she does not seek material perfection in her pictures and sculpture. Her end was not to please men's senses, but to save men's souls. Neither can one with any justice impute to her influence the decadence of art, for in the fourth century, even for material perfection, her pictures are a marvel of artistic beauty.

It is not to be thought, however, that Christian pictures or sculpture should not be as perfect as possible; that would be a mistake. The beauty of God's universe is for the children of God. But this perfection ought to be subordinate to the higher end which the Church, in her paintings, has in view.

For her noble end she made use of Christian artists as she found them; some were good, others only mediocre, some had to be trained anew. To these she taught Christian art—that is, the art which portrayed the religion taught by Jesus Christ Our Lord, thus planting holy thoughts in the mind, and in the heart the chaste love of eternal life. As to herself, history is witness of her respect for what was good in the monuments of Pagan art.

With this brief outline of the great principle underlying Christian art, we must pass to the illustrations that clothed this principle with life and shape. To recognize the positive value of the Christian sculptures of the Catacombs in their bearing upon religion, it should be remembered, furthermore, that these artists were under the systematic direction of the theologians of the Church, and what they depicted was nothing less than the expression in pictures and the symbolizing of the dogma of Catholic theology. And while to the Catholic mind, then, it conveyed the mysteries of faith as it does now, most plainly and vividly, to the mind of the pagan, from whom it was intended to conceal precisely that signification, it was but a meaningless grouping of signs and objects. In these scripturally theological writings, we find arguments for the belief, for instance, of the real presence in the Blessed Eucharist, in the first ages of the Church, so undeniable and convincing that were other testimonies to perish, a proof sufficient for any reasonable mind would here survive.

What were the subjects of these pictures? In the beginning they were a simple portrayal of some event of the Old Testament. Afterwards, combinations were made of various events that had relations one with the other, thus forming a connected and significant group or series. Then was devised a method of picturing occurrences, which may be called, not inaptly, the *Perspective of Faith*, wherein one scriptural event opens the vision of the mind to other events farther on in the landscape of Time. It was a way of representing a prophecy through the medium of art, and has received the name of *compenetration*.

This effect was produced by the following novel and interesting method. In a picture which represented a prophetic action, was placed not the person who performed that action, but the one who was prefigured in it. We shall make this clear by an example: In the place of Moses striking the rock, a figure of Christ Our Lord is represented in the same attitude.

Thus a picture was given, not of the real event, but of the figurative meaning of it, so that the personage or position represented by the artist became for the spectator the hieroglyphic key to determine the event to which the prophecy referred.

This secret of the meaning of Christian art, in some of its phases, before Fr. Garrucci's interpretation and systematic development, had been either only partly conjectured, or altogether unknown. By him the sculptures have been so coördinated and explained, and their meaning proved, that on this point his work has been acknowledged of the greatest value, and he is esteemed as the creator of the theory of Christian Art.

The researches of the illustrious Commendatore de Rossi, so well

known and so often alluded to by Fr. Garrucci, were chiefly directed to the architecture and inscriptions of the Catacombs; those of Fr. Garrucci were devoted almost exclusively to the sculptures and paintings. The work of both was based upon the same grand monuments, both were colossal and magnificent, and each has its own special merit and glory. In support of his general theory, Fr. Garrucci brings forward many testimonies of the Fathers of the Church, and for the interpretation of particular pictures he has made it evident by citations that the painter's object was to translate into images the symbolism contained in a page of the Fathers. He proves most conclusively that the sculptures are not, as some have asserted, but not proved, the result of the pious and unguided devotion of the early Christians. To explain this theory we shall make use of examples. These place before the mind more truly the meaning to be conveyed. To illustrate the fundamental principle, namely, that besides the scriptural event, the pictures represented the prophetic meaning, three examples may be chosen.

The first is a representation of Daniel taken from the entrance of the cemetery of Domitilla (Garrucci, *Hist. d. a. c.*, Plate 19, No. 1). Daniel is represented standing on a rock towards which two lions are approaching. His hands are extended in prayer. In this picture he is neither nude nor clothed in the Persian costume, for in both these ways he is represented in other pictures, but his garment is a short tunic fastened at the waist by a belt. Now many of these circumstances are quite at variance with the history of Daniel as we read it in the sacred scriptures, and especially that of placing him on an eminence instead of in the den of lions, as he is elsewhere represented. One unacquainted with the theory of Fr. Garrucci might cry out on beholding this picture, "Look at the ignorance, or at least the caprice, of the artist of the early Christians." He represents Daniel on a mountain surrounded by lions, when we know the place into which he was cast was deep, "for the accusers of Daniel did not reach the bottom of the den before the lions caught them and broke all their bones in pieces." But can we suppose that artists so experienced as these designers show themselves to be, were ignorant of so characteristic a point, and of a personage so well known? Or shall we imagine that the sacred ministers who presided over these early works of the Church failed to instruct them aright on such a point? It is more reasonable to judge that there is some strange secret meaning, to indicate which so notable an alteration has taken place in subjects so familiar.

From the writings of the Fathers, we know that Daniel condemned to the lions was a figure of Christ in His passion. To make this prophetic sense more apparent, Daniel is represented not in the den of lions, but on a hill, that of Calvary, and clothed,

furthermore, in the shepherd's tunic, as the Good Shepherd that "giveth His life for His sheep."

The second illustration may be taken from the bas-relief of a sarcophagus of Toulouse (Plate 319), which represents the sacrifice of Abraham. Abraham is in the act of sacrificing his son Isaac, who has his hands tied behind his back. Thus far the picture is faithful to the scripture narrative. But we notice other personages present, and this is contrary to the sacred text, which states explicitly that Abraham said to two young men with him: "Stay you here with the ass; I and the boy will go with speed as far as yonder, and after we have worshipped will return to you." (Gen. xxii., 5). Nevertheless, in this representation Abraham is surrounded by several persons, and among them a veiled woman stands at his right, and a young man near him to whom he speaks. This person is again represented in the attitude of beckoning to others who follow.

This variation seems to be against truth and propriety, for besides the divergence from the biblical text, it seems difficult to conjecture any suitable meaning. But by recalling to mind that the sacrifice of Isaac was a prophetic figure of the sacrifice of the cross, a meaning which the painter wished to make as vivid and actual as possible, every detail in this scene has its special significance. By that sacrifice was to be established the new covenant and the new Church, and hence we understand why that Church figured by the woman, together with her spouse, Christ, and the Apostles, are represented as present at the sacrifice.

The person speaking to Abraham represents Christ Our Lord, instead of the Angel who pointed out to Abraham the Lamb to be sacrificed in place of Isaac. The figure in the attitude of beckoning represents the vocation of the Gentiles, referring to the Redeemer promised to *Abram* at the time when his name was changed and he was called the Father of Nations, *Abraham*.

Our third illustration will be a brief reference to the Wedding at Cana so often represented on *Christian glass* (Plates 169, 1-7; 170, 1; 187, 1), where we constantly see seven jars depicted, when the Evangelist mentions only six. This variation is introduced to represent the fulness of grace signified by the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, obtained chiefly through the Blessed Eucharist, of which the changing of water into wine was a figure.

Thus we see that the subjects were taken from the New as well as from the Old Testament, and conveyed the same dogmatic or moral meaning as was taught by the Fathers of the Church.

Our author calls particular attention to one example of a glass jar in the celebrated Kircher Museum. It is the design of a fish on a gourd. What could such a combination signify without re-

course to the mystical meaning to explain the union? The prophet Jonas is so frequently represented reclining under the gourd vine that the gourd is taken as a symbol of the prophet. Now Jonas was three days in the whale's belly, and Christ was to be three days in the tomb. Hence, the gourd, the symbol of Jonas, and the fish, the symbol of Christ, are, in combination, a symbol of Christ's resurrection.

But here we must pause, for were we to mention but a fraction of the interesting subjects before us, our little explanation would swell to a volume. We cannot, however, omit one or two of the other curious and interesting modes of recalling the truths of religion by means of Christian art.

At times in these sacred sculptures there are united in one group actions which belong to different times, places, or persons. This method, as was noted above, has been called *compensation*. There are chiefly two classes; the first refers to the prophetic sense when, as we have seen in the example of Moses, into the *fact* of the prophecy is introduced the *person* of the fulfilment. The second method of compensation, also in use in profane art, and called the synthetic method, consists in uniting, in a single scene, the successive actions of the same persons. One of this class is the frequently repeated group of Adam and Eve, in which case we observe the combination of the successive events narrated in Genesis. In this one group we see the serpent twisted about the tree speaking to Eve; at the same time she holds the apple in her hand, while, on the other hand, Adam is making a gesture of deprecation and accusing the woman, and both are covered with leaves. Thus four successive actions are represented as one.

But not only do we find the coördination of events closely succeeding each other, but we see in these pictures the coördination of events that were separated by great intervals of time. On a beautiful sarcophagus of the Lateran (Plate 350) is a sculptured design divided into four parts. Each division makes up a complete subject, yet forming, with the other pictures, a continuous whole.

In the first section we behold the creation of man, and then our first parents fallen from grace, but consoled by the promise of a Redeemer. This is symbolized by Our Saviour, who carries in His arms a lamb and a sheaf of wheat. The first, a symbol of the bloody Sacrifice of the Cross, the second, a symbol of the unbloody Sacrifice of the Altar.

The second square shows the fulfilment of the prophecy of a Redeemer. The woman who was to crush the head of the serpent is represented together with her Divine Son. Fallen man, recognizing his Redeemer, is figured by the Magi, and the nations receiving the faith are symbolized by the cure of the man born blind.

The subject of the third picture is the manifestation by Christ of His Divine Mission by His miracles; His first one at Cana, His last one at Bethany, and the third one in the desert. These three are not chosen by chance. There was the evident purpose of representing the chief dogmas of Our Faith. In Cana and the desert we behold the Eucharist as sacrifice and sacrament; and in the raising of Lazarus, Our Lord's own resurrection.

The fourth portion in these pictures refers to three subjects concerning St. Peter, whose supremacy in the Church is the vital dogma of Christianity. This was most especially inculcated in that age to which the monument is referred, because of the heresy of the Donatists, who claimed to be the true Church of Christ. In the centre of this group of four pictures is one that may be called the Epilogue, as Fr. Garrucci terms it. It is Daniel in the lion's den, for this was a symbol both of the passion and of the resurrection of Christ, and of the Christian. For he, strengthened by the Eucharist, figured by the bread which Daniel received from Habacuc, hopes by the merits of the passion of Christ for the rewards of the resurrection. Is not this a sublime discourse? To it the author gives the name of Homily in Christian art. From these we learn the identity of our belief with that of the first ages, an argument for the Unity of the Church in her rites and her doctrines, even as the centuries roll on. And when the last wave of Time, striking upon the shores of Eternity, breaks and floats away, carrying with it into oblivion the sects and theories which deluded men have sought to substitute for her divine teaching—that wave will leave the Church of Christ, in the unchanging light of Eternity, standing upon the rock whereon He built her, the same as she stood in the Catacombs in the first century of her history. Numerous and magnificent as are the engravings in the work of Fr. Garrucci, its worth does not stop there. The first volume is devoted wholly to the developing and demonstrating of the different points of the theory of Christian art, and each point is supported by constant reference to the testimony of the monuments illustrated in the other five volumes. But this is only part of the work; and, although it may be the most delightful part of it, assuredly it is not the one which has cost the author the most labor. The treasures of Fr. Garrucci's erudition, skill and teaching are found in the learned explanations which accompany each plate. Here he gives the history of each monument, the proof of its authenticity, the correction of the errors in any previous publication of it. Besides the interpretation of the picture, its prophetic or mystical meaning, we find references to the texts and teaching of the Fathers, and deductions made from these mystical meanings.

In conclusion, few words are needed to say what a magnificent

treasure lies in these volumes, for the art-student, the archaeologist, the historian, the curious inquirer as to the belief of the Primitive Church, and to the theologian. But apart from their value to these, it is not easy to over-estimate their usefulness to those who would wish to examine the costumes and customs of the early days of Christianity. There we find described and depicted the garments worn at the different periods. The exterior and interior robe, the Phœnician dalmatic, the chasuble, and the open and sleeveless tunic, the toga and the pallium. How interesting for the casual reader to note that the altar vestment worn by the priest in those days differed but little from the costume of daily life, and how, as the fashions of worldly life changed, the Church in her rites, as in harmony with her doctrines, remained unchanged, so that the chasuble of a priest at the altar to-day is but a slight variation from the civil garb worn by men in the early ages of the Church.

When Our Lord, instructing his disciples in the spirit of the missionary's life, sent them out on their career of Apostolic labor, He told them not to take two tunics. As an example of the fact that but one was worn, it is related of St. John that when he gave his tunic to a certain Aristodemus, he had no other tunic, but remained wrapped in his outer garment or pallium.

There we learn how ancient is the custom of cutting the beard and hair: "*Clericus nec comam nutriat nec barbam*" (398 A.D., Conc. Carth. iv., Can. 44); and whatever the meaning of these words, in many of the paintings the men are represented with smooth faces.

Again, how much light is here thrown upon various expressions in Scripture otherwise barely intelligible, the gestures in prayer, the lifting of hands, the embracing of the feet and knees in sign of adoration or supplication, as when Mary at the Resurrection threw herself at Our Lord's feet, or at Bethany sat in silence there while Martha "was busied about many things." What a source of unfailing delight to turn these beautifully engraved pages, so beautiful in their simplicity, so sublime in the mysterious meanings therein signified, so filled with wonder and interest when one has the key to open up the hidden meanings of Faith. There is about it that exquisite charm for the human mind awakened on meeting some unknown problem of nature, a problem the more interesting from the fact that one has in his power a clue to solve the mystery.

Perhaps these magnificent volumes, this monument of art, this storehouse of history and masterpiece in the annals of archaeology, may be inaccessible to our American students. It is to be hoped, however, that this want will be supplied, that a work so valuable

in itself and so replete with interest from so many points of view, will not be reserved to visitors of European libraries alone. The perfection of the plates, their number, elegance, and the skill of execution, make the work a marvel in the art of engraving. Let it be hoped, then, that in all our libraries, or at least in those that pretend to completeness in valuable books, and especially those which take a just pride in their art collections, this work, the basis of Christian Art, will find its place for the instruction and the admiration of all who are interested in religion, art, archæology, and history, and especially in the religion and art history of the earlier days of the Christian World.

IS THE CHURCH GAINING OR LOSING GROUND IN CATHOLIC COUNTRIES?

IT is necessary that we first explain the question, What do we mean by the words "gaining" and "losing"? It is obvious that the Church may gain or lose ground in three senses which are perfectly distinct: first, as to the number of professing Catholics; secondly, as to the force of religion in the national life; thirdly, as to the collective influence of clergy and laity over the civil or political powers of the country. That these three senses are distinct, and may even sometimes be at issue, is made apparent by what we see around us every day. The number of professing Catholics in any country does not indicate the national earnestness or the national sloth. In France there are thousands of persons professing Catholicity who do not trouble themselves with its duties or its obligations. So that our second sense, "the force of religion in the national life," is not commensurate with the numerical force of professing Catholics. And as to our third sense, how is it possible that any Catholic community should have "collective influence over the institutions of the country," if the fashion of the age is to "take religion very easily," or to divorce it from all overt acts of the public life?

A good deal of misapprehension must be necessarily engendered by the political attitude of a (Catholic) government towards the Church. Politics, in their bearing on Catholic vitality, are very intricate and delicate matters for Catholic critics. Theoretically, the general principles of political justice are subjected, and must

always be so, to the Supreme Authority; while, practically, the actual noise of political systems somewhat deafens the popular sense as to their true merits. People are so apt to decry a system as being hostile to the spirit of the Catholic Church, when it is not the system, but the governing minds who administer it, who are responsible for a very painful antagonism. The French Republic, like the ardent Absolutism of Louis XIV., has been very heartily abused by some Catholic critics. Yet has Absolutism or Republicanism been more offensive? Was an absolutism which *used* religion as its political handmaid—while doing nothing for the practical advance of pure religion—less pernicious than is a republic which sets religion quite aside, or even persecutes its priests or professors? The question is worth asking; because some people think “The Republic” to be the mother of all impiety in modern France. Is it a whit more so than was the religious Cæsarism of Louis XIV., who, while affecting to be the eldest son of the Church, set an example, at Versailles, which was not edifying? Is it not better to have a government which is not Catholic, or which is even anti-Catholic in its temper (and which, therefore, avoids the scandal of hypocrisy), than to have a government which so combines religion with the world that the latter is the senior partner and the director? Is it not better for the clergy, and better for the laity, and better, also, for the outside countries which are looking on? To sail under our own flag is at least ingenuous; and, as to persecution, it does not matter one straw. Persecution is a high wind which freshens the heart; while hypocrisy is a sultry mist which sickens the soul. Open warfare is much better than sham peace. Louis XIV. did more harm to religion than does M. Constans or M. Paul Bert. We know what we are about with a professed enemy. But a Catholic Cæsarism, which only *used* the Catholic religion, was a despotism at once spiritual and political.

It is strange that non-Catholics have been, as a rule, the stoutest defenders of what is called “the divine right of kings.” Indeed, Cæsarism is modern; it is not Catholic. The Emperor of all the Russias (like two of the Stuarts of England, and also like Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth) is supreme autocrat of souls as well as of bodies. There is, of course, a reason why this should be so. If a potentate claims to be a pontiff, he may consistently demand and receive reverence. “I am to you in the place of the Pope,” says Alexander III. to his subjects; and so said Queen Elizabeth and Henry VIII. But no Catholic sovereign can say this. For above the Catholic sovereign is the Supreme Pontiff, to whom he, like his subjects, is submissive. Now, if we consider what must be the effect on a Catholic nation of the attitude of its government

towards religion, we easily apprehend that the aspects of that attitude may be to them (and to us) very delusive. A people is apt to be judged by its government; or is supposed to create the tone of its government. This really is not true in Catholic countries. That France is republican is an accident of past mistakes; that the Republic is a mixed quantity,—half Catholic, half infidel,—is an accident of the political circumstances of the times. That the French republic *might be* wholly Catholic, and *might be* the most desirable government for the French, we can easily believe, if only the Catholics of France were as earnest about politics as about religion. But they are not so. French Catholics are not much busied with politics. That is to say, they feel an interest in politics; but prefer the quiet of their religion to demonstration. The free-thinkers are the real political agitators. And once in power, they have a bad trick of persecuting the very Catholics who have lifted them up to their position. But the Catholics are very reposeful in their politics. They talk of them in their homes, and among their friends, but they do not hurry into the arena of political combat. They deplore every government attack upon religion, but they do not rush to take up arms against the aggressors. They read, with an impassioned interest, every Catholic journal or brochure which takes the side of the Catholic faith against the free-thinkers; yet they stop short at such honest literary enthusiasm, and rather hope than struggle manfully for better days. This characteristic of the vast majority of “good” French Catholics produces, necessarily, a wrong impression on the outer world. American, English, Irish Protestants naturally jump at the easy inference that a Catholic nation which patiently *suffers* an un-Catholic government cannot be really Catholic at heart. Hence the assumption (which we see expressed in Protestant newspapers) that “the Catholic Church is losing ground in Catholic France.” Political *power* it is quite certain that the Church has lost; a Catholic *government* it is quite certain France has lost; yet if we compare the France of to-day with the France of Louis XIV., she is more Catholic to-day than she was then. Leaving out of the reckoning the peasantry of France, who have always been what they are now, intensely Catholic, the upper classes and the upper middle-classes are higher-toned Catholics to-day than they were when vulgar Cæsarism *used* the Church. The bishops are higher-toned, because they rebuke an *infidel* government, instead of shutting their eyes and ears to an *immoral* government. The aristocrats are higher-toned, because they keep their religion and their politics two distinct, and not two impossibly-mixed classes. The business classes are higher-toned, because they have their principles differentiated, and know exactly which is the Church, which the devil. In the old Versailles

days, the world, the flesh and the devil were all in active fraternity with the show of Faith. This was rotten. We may hail the present antagonism in the French nation, between religion and the *de facto* governing authorities, as a healthy and manly substitute for that most detestable of all hypocrisies—the *using* of the Catholic faith as a political bulwark.

While speaking of France, we must remember, also, that its literature has to be taken account of quite as much as its Government. Yet, whether we take the Catholic literature or the infidel literature of to-day, there is nothing in either to make us conclude, with despondency, that the Catholic Church has lost ground in Catholic France. The French Catholic literature, solely in the sense of Catholic journalism, is abundant in bravery as in circulation. No one expects that what are popularly known as “religious papers” can equal in number the “all round” papers of the same country; because the “all round” papers generally *include* religious news, while religious papers generally *exclude* secular news. Yet, of the 1568 Parisian journals, and the 2506 provincial journals, the vast majority are most respectful towards religion; the small minority are equally blatant and atheistic. And this is a healthy sign: that religion and irreligion have their separate and openly hostile literary camps; trimming or hypocrisy being no weakness of the French character, as it is of the English journalistic leading-article character! Indeed, in all Catholic countries there is this thoroughly wholesome trait: that the two camps, the two standards, have their flags. They nail their flags to the mast, and do not give their left hand to the enemy while giving their right hand to those who “increase their circulation.” The English Protestant press is chameleon in its religiosity; so that while advocating Christian virtues in rounded periods, it pats the Pagan Mr. Herbert Spencer on the back, or approves the “daring honesty” of Mr. Bradlaugh. To find out the religious principles of the *Times* newspaper,—or, for that matter, of the *Daily Telegraph* or the *Daily News*, or even of the so-called religious English newspapers, would tax the powers of the most subtle analyst of human writings, because the affirmations are mostly constructed out of the negatives. But it is not so with the French journalists or French essayists. If they are skeptical, they do not pretend to be pious; if they are infidel, they do not pretend to be Christian.

An American or English Protestant will argue plausibly: “The French nation is quite obviously infidel, because so many of its journalists profess impiety.” These reasoners ignore the fact that French writers *say* what they are, whereas a leading article writer in the weathercock London *Times* writes *outside* himself or his own opinions. He poses in a fictitious attitude of superiority,

intended to impose on all believers and all unbelievers. A few weeks ago a *Times* leader writer informed his readers that the Roman Jesuits had designed to poison Leo XIII. unless he conceded liberties to their Society, which concessions he had been prudent enough to make. "If we are unwilling to credit the current report at Rome," wrote this sapient gentleman (possibly smiling), "it is not because it reflects on the Jesuits, but rather because it reflects on the Pope." So that the playful gossip of a few Italians, indulged in as a good joke, is set down as a "current report," which it was not, and the whole body of Italian Jesuits are branded as poisoners, at least in their moral bent or disposition. After this statement of fact came the sublime Christian reflection that "the morality of the Italians, *imperfect as it is* [English morality is well known to be typical, especially in Printing House Square], is indebted largely to Catholic teaching and supervision." Now this sort of balderdash is exceptionally Protestant. French infidel journalists would not stoop to it. To hit with the right hand and caress with the left hand is an odd state of the affections, but it is not French. "The most unscrupulous Society in the world," says the *Times* writer, meaning, of course, the Society of Jesus, "is stated to be obnoxious to the public conscience [we had always imagined that a conscience was purely private and that no two people could go halves in the same conscience] because it contemplates the horrible actuality of the world finally escaping from the control of the Church," which control, as the same writer assures us, "is the *only* moral control which remains over millions of Italians." Such twaddle as this is exceptionally Protestant. No French journalist would sign his name to it. And it is because the French journalists are outspoken, are at least manly, instead of rounding nonsensical periods to please all Protestants, that superficial non-Catholics in America and in England put an utterly wrong construction on their blatancy. The old French philosophers, like the rabid Voltaire, kept outside the sickly assumption of moralizing, and, while snorting and neighing against Catholicity, never appropriated infallible morals to themselves. The Protestant mind is deeply grieved at the "imperfect morality" of the Italians, which it seeks to mend by imbecile falsehoods about the Jesuits. Protestantism is too unreal to be judicial. Nor can the Protestant mind draw just conclusions as to the "gaining or losing ground" of the Catholic Church in any (recognized) Catholic country, because it does not know the difference between Catholic affirmatives and negatives, between postulates and opinions in the Catholic sense.

To speak of Italy: It can hardly be viewed like other countries, because of the exceptional irritation of "the Roman question."

Rome was seized fourteen years ago by a *coup de main* of outsiders, and at once became, and has always remained, a seat of war. Politics, not religion, governs Rome. "United Italy" takes for its postulate, "we must keep Rome;" and that postulate necessarily involves ousting the Pope. What then? Has the Catholic Church lost ground in the Papal States—or throughout Italy—by the accident of the Pope losing his temporal power? The Catholic Church may have been grievously weakened in what is understood by "the Executive;" its bishops and clergy may have been wounded, *through* their Pontiff, in the dignity or independence of their Order; yet, after all, what is all this but persecution, and when did persecution harm Catholics? Such material warfare as that levelled against the Propaganda is, of course, a material injury to "the Executive," just as the seizing of the material property of monks or nuns, or the confiscation of ecclesiastical sources of revenue, is at once extremely barbarous and extremely insolent; yet what we understand by the Catholic Church "losing ground" is not her suffering from that antagonism which was always her lot and always must be (for how is it possible that the Catholic Church can be unlike her Lord?), it is the actual loss of Catholic souls—of those souls who have lost the faith, or of those souls who ought to have been, but who have been prevented being, Catholic. This seems to be the only just acceptance of such an expression as "losing ground" in regard to the Church. That the Italians acted wickedly in seizing the States of the Church, and that they have acted wickedly in confiscating Church property, "goes without saying" in the Catholic conscience. Yet, after all, it was *only* persecution. And as to affirming that the Catholic Church can "lose ground" by being persecuted, we should be affirming a flat denial of a Catholic principle. The Protestant fanatics, of course, shouted, "The Pope has fallen!" when, for about the fiftieth time, brigandage got the better of him; precisely in the same spirit in which unbelievers in the time of Christ made His humiliation a subject for triumphant mockery; but the whole interpretation of persecution by the Catholic mind is that it is a "gain," not a "loss," to the Catholic Church. Such a reflection seems unavoidable when considering the question: "Has the Catholic Church lost ground in Catholic Italy?" The answer is, and most emphatically, it has not. Numerically, there are as many Catholics—professing Catholics—as there were before the Garibaldian aggression; and, as to the force of the Catholic religion in the Italian life, it is as keen as it was before the persecution.

It must be remembered that there are two Italys, just as there are two Frances. The Catholic camp and the United Italy camp are in hostility in Italy; especially are they in hostility in Rome.

It is allowed by even the Italianissimi that not one-tenth part of Italians had any voice in the "returns" of the present Parliament, and that the nine-tenths, if they spoke their real mind, would be in favor of the restoration of the Papal power. The "Abstentionists" in Italy, like the same class in France, represent the national will or political sentiment. Difficult as it is to get at numbers where "abstention" is the principal factor in the arithmetic, few of the most ardent Italianissimi would deny to you (if you engaged them in a private conversation) that the Papal party is an *imperium in imperio*, and that the Papal *imperium* is the "national" one. Great as is the force of the Masonic hierarchy and of that "possession which is nine points of the law," they who know what was the machinery of the usurpation, and what is the machinery of the occupation, estimate the "logic of facts" at its true value. Now, under the flag of the Italianissimi are ranged the least Catholic forces—as well as the most anti-Catholic forces—of United Italy, while under the flag of the "Papal party" are ranged those forces which are at least primarily, if not ardently or even exclusively, Catholic. In other words, the Italian nation is Catholic; nor has the Church lost one inch of ground in a religious sense. The elements of the Italian life which are *now* anti-Catholic are the elements which *would* have been so under any circumstances.

That France is now Republican and that Italy is in an unsettled state are facts which, in combination, make the two nations, politically, to look somewhat uneasily at one another. Most of the Italian anti-Papal party would prefer to have an Italian republic, and they have a fear lest the restoration of the French monarchy might tell heavily against their anti-Papal "next move." The anti-Catholic party in France would prefer anything to a restoration, because of its (probable) Catholic tendencies in France and Italy. And so the purely political atmosphere is darkly clouded in both countries by the anti-Catholic hopes and struggles of the governing bodies. Such reflections are quite sufficient to indicate the grave difficulty of judging accurately as to the relative strength of "religious parties."

The French Government, having occupied itself assiduously (during the whole period of the establishing of the New Italy) in worrying bishops, priests and all religious, in bringing up a generation of godless children, and in casting away all holy images from official courts, in "whittling the Concordat" (as a Frenchman put it), and in cutting down the stipends of ecclesiastics, is necessarily in closest sympathy with an anti-Papal Italian Government, and with all Italians who prefer overthrow to legitimacy. The Italianissimi, having emptied the convents, and filled the gaols as the best means of striking a balance, are dear to those French-

men who think the Catechism of M. Defuissieux a fine piece of dogmatic theology for their schools. But what has all this to do with the real loss or the real gain of Catholic ground in Catholic France and Catholic Italy, except so far as it serves to indicate the utter shallowness of hastily concluding that there *has been* a real loss or a real gain? We might as well conclude, when the clouds are thick and murky, or when snow or hail peppers our eyes in the winter, that the sky is no longer blue above the storm, as conclude that the political noise of socialist-democrats disturbs the placid faith of a Catholic people. Such an inference would be quite the reverse of what is true. In everyday life there are scores of instances of what we call "distractions" from our serenity; yet, these we take as natural, or as probationary. And such are the political noises, or "distractions," in the daily, in the centuried, life of the Catholic Church.

Mark, too, one immense gain in all times of persecution: "The purifying of the character of the clergy." By "character" we mean their class-distinctiveness; their recognized official place and superiority. It stands to reason that, in times of ease, when court, palace, and even counting-house, are thrown open, as a matter of course, to the Catholic clergy,—when there is no rupture between the world and religion,—the clergy, being but human, will grow languid in their apostleship, will not feel the necessity of being heroic. This was, certainly, the case in France, in the pre-Revolution period, when monarchy had come to *patronize* bishops and priests. Bishops and priests—that is, some of them, some who moved about the court—grew into the habit of submitting to be patronized, and hence they weakened that national respect which, had it been what it is now, might have mollified the outbreak of the Revolution. People know what the world is; and people know what religion is; and they hate to see the two wearing the same clothes. And it was one of the fruits of that apparent alliance between the court and some Catholic dignitaries (an apparent alliance which, at least, prevented more than one bishop from openly rebuking court-worldliness and immorality) that "the people" lost their honor for the "superior clergy;" and that even the "inferior clergy" got the credit of being courtiers. It must be remembered that no atmosphere could be more corrupting than that of the Court of the so-called Grand Monarque. Royalism had reached a point when the imbecility of rank-worship simply unmanned the strongest wills and stoutest hearts. It was the climax before the utterly abysmal fall. "Was the French Revolution more injurious in its moral tendencies than the age of aristocratic worldliness which preceded it?" was a question which was recently given in an examination-paper in the Grands Semi-

naires of France. As a matter of opinion, it may be hazarded that almost anything is preferable to a haughty patronage of the dignitaries of the Church, by a court which plays fast and loose with Catholic interests, while playing loose only in its moral example. This allusion may suffice to show that the Catholic Church may "lose ground" under the outward profession of the Catholic faith *plus* worldliness; while it helps us to understand that the Catholic faith may "gain ground" under the winnowing influences of persecution. The French clergy of to-day are the very salt of the earth; and the same truth holds good of most Catholic clergy, in all countries which are commonly called Catholic. The reason is that the world is doing them the greatest possible service in bringing all their finest qualities into full play. While imagining that to cut down their stipends, or to fine them for breaking some wicked law, is to lower their dignity or their influence, the anti-Catholic powers are really exalting the Catholic hierarchy into the very position which is the most teaching, the most commanding. Cardinal Guibert was profoundly respected by *all* Frenchmen, because he kept the Church's enemies in their right place. The world is not a fool, if it be worldly; nor does it fail to honor consistency, if it dislike it. The Church has gained ground in the last dozen years, in the sense that all Frenchmen know perfectly what it *means*. And the same truth holds good in regard to Italy. Better far is a persecution-created distinctness than a serenity-created muddle of indifferentism.

Yet, let us be just to non-Catholics, and admit that they have apology for (*primâ facie*) suspecting a weakening of the old foundations. It may be hazarded that there are five (new) reasons in chief why the Church might *seem* to be losing ground in Catholic countries; that is, might seem so to the non-Catholic:

(1.) The growth of a Free Press, in almost all civilized countries, has led to everybody reading and talking everything, with but a superficial apprehension about anything. The use of the rake,—not of the spade,—with most of the students of modern journalism, has engendered a spirit which finds its outlet in an airy or jaunty chatter about the most difficult and mysterious of soul-problems; so that this perpetual chatter gives the impression to the ordinary observer, that divine faith has tumbled down into human opinion.

(2.) Freethinking has become aggressive, instead of being shy or apologetic; pushing its warfare into the inmost camps of Christianity, and trusting to its new Agnosticism to upset the facts of the Old Testament, or to trace a natural evolution in Christianity. This aggressiveness, from the very loftiness of what it attacks, is assumed, by easy thinkers, to promise victory.

(3.) The State-insistence on civil marriage and on godless schools looks like a gain of gross secularism over the Church.

(4.) The increase of democracy *plus* a Socialism which is not Christian, is taken to be a successful protest against Divine Authority; for, though the Catholic Church has never condemned any kind or form of government,—not even a Christian kind of Socialism,—it has always insisted on obedience to authority, and such obedience is, in these days, made light of.

(5.) The very difficulty of deciding positively what *is* a Catholic country makes it easy for the non-Catholic to find apologies. "Is France a Catholic country?" asks a skeptical London journalist. "Why, even China has grown disgusted with having her Christian settlements protected by such a quasi-pagan power as that of France, which, at home, marches its soldiers away from church, but, in China, pretends to want to march them into it." This writer might have quieted himself with the assurance that it was French Catholics who planted Catholicity in China. Yet, the difficulty is a grave one for Protestant apologists, and it may be well to devote a moment to considering it.

The ordinary idea of "a Catholic country" is "a country of which the majority are Catholics." France, with a government practically infidel, Austria, with a government practically Catholic, Ireland, with a government practically Protestant, are admittedly Catholic countries. Yet, we must remember that, as to Protestant countries, where a Catholic minority has great force, or even as to anti-Christian countries, where a Catholic minority has gained a footing, the gain or loss of the Catholic Church (in the admittedly Catholic mother-country) must be reckoned in connection with its missions. China's 2,000,000 of Catholics, with its 28 bishops and vicars apostolic, with its 230 French missionaries, and its (about) 600 Jesuit missionaries, must be "put down" to the credit of Catholic nations—must be regarded as integral parts of those nations. So, too, the Dominicans and Augustinians from Spain, with help, also, from Belgium and other countries, must be allowed to claim (Catholic) China as adding to those Catholic "gains," which may be justly attributed to their own countries. And, again, in regard to the Indies,—where Leo XIII. has just created a complete Catholic hierarchy,—the number of Catholics in British India alone is computed at 1,349,878, while in the Portuguese territory there are over 252,400. When we add 3,320 churches, 1,652 schools, 41 seminaries or colleges, 123 religious communities, and a variety of other Catholic establishments, we see that Portugal, France, and even England, may have a good deal to say about the Church *at home* gaining ground in foreign countries.

The Catholic population of the Indies is not very far short of

2,000,000, and its increase (by well authorized statistics) is not less than 12,000 a year. Now, when we are trying to answer the question, "Is the Church gaining or losing ground in Catholic countries?" we may fairly answer: "We must be allowed to take into computation the ground gained by Catholic countries in pagan countries." An Indian baptized at Goa by a French priest may be claimed by that French priest for a French Catholic. Father Grassi, in any missionary victory in North America, or Bishop Salvado, in any Catholic conquest in New Norcia, may write home to say that his own country counts one more Catholic; that there is a "gain" of one soul to the mother-land. This is a perfectly legitimate view of "gain and loss." We all remember what Macaulay said about the Church in the New World gaining more than she had lost in the Old World; and so it is to-day, and ever will be, so long as the Catholic Church shall stay on earth. A loss in the home-country is made up in a foreign country; but it was the home missionary who sowed, tilled and reaped the wheat. A Catholic community may wear the laurel of all its conquests all over the world, regarding its missionaries and their converts as Catholic brothers.

Some people have argued that the Catholic Church must be gaining ground, in its relations to the national political power, if the respect which is shown to the Catholic chief is greater than that shown to the non-Catholic chief. As an illustration: The present position of Dr. Walsh, the patriotic Archbishop of Dublin, is evidenced as showing both that Irish Catholics have gained ground, and that the English government has had to acknowledge that they have done so. The argument might, perhaps, be pushed too far. What *is* shown by such a fact is that the Supreme Pontiff fully recognizes that there is no conflict with Catholic principles in the Irish struggle, and that the English government has had to "eat humble pie," in being told this fact plainly by the Pontiff. It would not be accurate to conclude that St. Thomas Becket, by his contests with Henry II. (like Dunstan or Langton in the same country, or like Ximenes in Catholic Spain), proved that the principles for which *he* contended were the principles in highest favor among Catholics. All that was proved was, that the respect commanded by exalted Catholics was greater than the respect commanded by any one else. But this was a respect for their sublime office. The present Catholic Archbishop of Westminster has a much higher ecclesiastical influence in England—among all bodies or sects of professing Christians—than has any Anglican bishop or archbishop. The whole world *recognizes* a Catholic dignitary. Cardinal Newman has a higher place, intellectually,—in connection with his Christian influence or example,—than has the present

respected occupant of the See of Canterbury. The recognition of ecclesiastical force is conceded *solely* to Catholic dignitaries. And this fact, as it is established in Protestant countries, must be taken as showing that the Protestant estimate of the Catholic religion is not affected by the scandalous "accidents" of some Catholic countries. The truth is, that intelligent Protestants fully recognize the parentage of all anti-Catholic movements in Catholic countries, knowing that the "Reformation" has simply developed, in these days, into a ripened and perfectly logical antitheism. What is Christian among non-Catholics is solely Catholic—and there are millions of thoroughly honest and earnest Protestants. Yet, all educated non-Catholics recognize these two facts: that the scandals in Catholic countries are *not* Catholic, and that the divine authority of the Holy See is as widely recognized in our own time as when Sir Thomas Moore laid his head upon the block.

It is a saying of Cardinal Newman, that Protestants have this advantage, in quoting scandals from the history of the Catholic Church, that they can travel over a period of eighteen centuries, whereas their own religion has lasted only three. Suppose that, in the days of St. Athanasius,—when "Athanasius contra mundum" summed "the loss,"—the question had been asked: "Is the Church gaining or losing ground in Catholic countries?" we can well imagine how the anti-Catholics of that period would have insisted on their gains or the Church's loss. Such an example serves to show that both the black clouds and the blue sky are perfectly familiar to the life of our eighteen centuries. The oppression of to-day becomes the victory of to-morrow. Louis Veuillot made us smile, during the heat of the Bismarck warfare against the Catholic bishops and priests of his new Germany, by telling us how a stately gentleman had called upon Prince Bismarck, and asked him this very unpleasant, personal question: "How long do you think it will take you to conquer the Church?" Prince Bismarck gave the best answer that occurred to him. The stately gentleman gravely rejoined: "I have been trying my best for eighteen centuries, but without success, to accomplish what *you* think to do in your little life." The sole results of the Bismarck warfare have been to increase the number of Catholics in every province of the new German (Protestant) Empire; and to force the eulogism from the now concessive Protestant Chancellor, that "Leo XIII. is the wisest statesman of the age." Thus, at any one given moment, it might be natural to think despondingly, "The Church is losing ground in this or that country;" and in less than a dozen years such an opinion would be reversed, and the Protestant enemy would be proved to be the Church's friend.

Doubtless, as has been suggested, there are *new* phases of an-

tagonism in the modern conflict of the world with the Church. Leo XIII., in a recent Encyclical Letter addressed to the Hungarian Episcopate, alluded to a few of these novelties. Things which are "out of harmony with the natural law, quite as much as with the Christian law;" the labors of the neo-philosophers, of journalists, of novelists, of masonic lodges, of innumerable secret societies, in the direction of banishing religion from education, and of secularising the sacrament of matrimony; the growth of anti-Christian Socialism (quite distinct from "advanced" views about democracy), which is parallel with the appalling increase of bitter poverty among the humbler classes, and of fantastic opulence among the higher or aristocratic classes; the consequent popularity of the fallacious principle of Prudhon (now warmly adopted by the proletariat), "Property is robbery:" these are some of the *new* phases of nineteenth century antagonism, which make it appear as though the Church were "losing ground." Add one other calamity: that, of all the great powers of the world, one only can be called Catholic in its administration; Austria being Catholic, but France and Italy being freethinking (administratively, that is, though not nationally); Germany being Protestant, Russia being schismatical, and the United States and Great Britain being "anythingarian;" and it is obvious that the Government forces of our present time are not ranged on the side of Catholicity.

Yet, on the other side of the question there is a vast deal to be said, in proof that the Church is "gaining ground." Let us very briefly refer to seven points: (1) The same literary activity which is ranged on the side of error is ranged on the side of the Catholic Church; with this advantage to the latter, that all Catholic writers adopt the *same*, but all non-Catholic writers a *different* advocacy. Catholics differ about politics quite as much as do non-Catholics; but in regard to the Faith there is no such thing as an opinion: the Faith excludes variety or mutability. Therefore the literary gain to the Catholic faith, during the last fifty years, has been a hundred-fold greater than has been the Protestant gain; since every one who reads Catholic writings is drawn towards the *same truth*, but every one who reads non-Catholic writings, to *different errors*. And it may be said that Catholic journalism is on the increase. It is a fair subject for congratulation that the Catholic Press of the United States includes seven monthly magazines and thirty newspapers. There is a similar progress in Catholic journalism throughout the world. And since Catholic journals offer far less "general reading" to their subscribers than does any class of secular or mixed journals, it is a certainty that the literary mission of the Catholic journalists has been crowned with greater success than that of the sectaries.

(2.) The conversions to the Catholic faith, throughout the world, have far exceeded the protestations of apostasy. And since every conversion is a confession of a positive, but every apostasy a protestation of a negative, the world is more edified by one conversion to the Church, than it is surprised by any amount of departures from it.

(3.) The establishment of new Catholic hierarchies in many countries of the world, or,—as in Great Britain,—the revival of two ancient ones, is a clear proof that, if there be any loss in any Catholic country, it is much more than made up in non-Catholic countries.

(4.) That in all those Catholic countries where there has been a political warfare with the Church, the Church is getting the better in the struggle; and this so much so that all respectable non-Catholic journalists point out the folly and the criminality of such a “policy,” is a proof that the “mind of the age” is full of homage for that institution which can always bend or suffer, but can not be broken.

(5.) The *only* religion which is ever attacked by any freethinker, in any country whether Catholic or non-Catholic, is that religion which is known as the Catholic; and this fact is sufficient evidence that, by politicians as by scientists, by historians as by philosophers, by good and bad alike all over the world, the intellectual position of the Church is acknowledged to be the highest which is known to that boastful activity, Modern Thought.

(6.) The visible unity of the Church has been made to us more apparent since the promulgation of the dogma of Infallibility; the visible disunion of all the sectarians and of all the freethinkers having been rendered more apparent *pari passu*. Thus the sensible force of the Catholic religion has been more appreciable in Catholic countries, during the very period when the new antagonism has been most rampant; its perfect oneness being a “gain” in a double sense—in enjoying the Catholic Faith, and in resisting enemies.

(7.) The utter collapse of all missionary Protestantism in every country known as Catholic, is a “gain” to the Church of incomparable value, much more than freethinking is a “loss.” Freethinkers in Catholic countries are the “free and easy” members of society, who *would be* free and easy if there were no vagary called “freethinking,” but who now adopt that fashionable cloak for veiling their hearts. So long as the Protestant sects affected *religious* superiority, they did enormous mischief against the Church; but now that in France and in Belgium, and above all in Catholic Ireland, Protestantism has come to a dead stand-still, and does not

even affect to "convert" anybody, Catholics have only one enemy—the infidel. This is a vast gain to Catholic countries. Two camps on the Christian side made civil war: there are two camps still in these days—but on opposite sides.

So that, viewing the subject all around, we may conclude, and with gratitude, that the Catholic Church is *not* losing ground. That her enemies will try to believe that she is doing so, and that they will make war on her to the end of the world, is too absolute a certainty to need discussing. They will be the more boastful, the more persecuting, the more delirious, in the exact proportion of her renewed vigor and her victories. Cardinal Newman, in one of his merry bits of sarcasm, thus laughs at the undying hopefulness of the Church's enemies: "She shall be always worsted in the warfare, ever unhorsed and disarmed, ever running away, ever frustrated, ever smashed and pounded, ever dying, ever dead; and the only wonder is that she has to be killed so often, and the life to be so often trodden out of her, and her priests and doctors to be so often put down, and her monks and nuns to be exposed so often, and such vast sums to be subscribed by Protestants, and such great societies to be kept up, and such millions of tracts to be written, and such persecuting Acts to be passed in Parliament, in order thoroughly, and once for all, and for the very last time, and for ever and ever, to annihilate her once more."

RELATIVE CONDITION OF WOMAN UNDER PAGAN AND CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION.

I.

THE family is the source of society; the wife is the source of the family. If the fountain is not pure, the stream is sure to be foul and muddy. Social life is the reflex of family life.

The history of woman in Pagan countries has been, with rare exceptions, an unbroken record of bondage, oppression, and moral degradation. She had no rights that the husband felt bound to respect. In many of the ancient empires of Asia, notably in Babylon, India, Thrace and Lydia, the wife was bought, like meat in the shambles, or like slaves in the market-place.¹ Every woman, no matter of what rank, had to submit to be dishonored once in her life by some stranger in the temple of Venus.²

Her life was one of abject misery and unrequited toil. Ministering to-day to the capricious passion of her husband, to-morrow she is exposed to all the revulsions of feeling that follow the gratification of animal appetites.³ "Among the Indians," says Strabo, "wives are purchased from their parents for a price equal to that of two head of cattle. They are treated as mere servants by their husbands, who have the right to scourge them as their caprices may dictate."⁴ To speak to any one of the wives of the king of Persia, or even to approach too near her chariot while on a journey, was punished with death. And it is worthy of remark that the same law obtains in that country even to this day.

In Scythia, Tartary, and other countries, the wife who had the misfortune to survive her husband was immolated on his tomb.⁵ The same inhuman custom of self-immolation by widows, or *Suttee*, as it was popularly called, prevailed in India, till it was abolished by the English government in 1847. Previously to that period, several ineffectual attempts had been made to put an end to the practice. The Brahmins denounced the humane efforts of the English government as an unwarrantable interference with their religion. We may form some idea of the frequency of these human sacrifices from the fact that, between 1815 and 1826, 7154 cases of *Suttee* were officially reported to have occurred in Bengal alone.

Another scourge of woman was polygamy. By its baneful in-

¹ Herodot., I., No. 196.

³ Lecky, *Hist. of European Morals*.

⁵ Herodotus, B. I.

² *Ibid.*, No. 199.

⁴ L. XV., p. 68.

fluence, her empire over the domestic kingdom was divided, and her conjugal rights were violated. No one can read Herodotus, the Father of History, without being painfully impressed with the loose ideas of marriage prevailing in Asia. Throughout that vast continent polygamy might be said to have been universal. The Zend-Avesta (or law-book of the Persians) prescribed no rule limiting the number of wives for each household. A maiden, remaining unmarried till her eighteenth year, was threatened with the most severe punishment in the life to come.¹ They regarded the strength of the nation as depending more upon the number of children than upon integrity of morals.

The Medes, according to the testimony of Strabo, were compelled by law to have at least seven wives. The Mongols, the Tartars, and the people of the ancient empire of China legally sanctioned community of wives. The same custom prevailed among the Massagetæ, as Herodotus affirms.² Polygamy was regarded as honorable among the ancient Huns and Goths. A man's dignity was estimated by the number of his wives. In no country was the domestic life more grossly dishonored than in Great Britain.³

Tacitus represents the domestic life of the Germans in a very favorable light. His honest indignation at the moral corruption of his country-women may have prompted him to embellish the sanctity of marriage among the Germans. Of nearly all barbarous nations, he says that they alone were content with one wife, excepting the nobles, who had a retinue of wives, more from a sense of dignity than from luxury. Swift and severe was the punishment meted out to an adulterous wife. Her hair was cut off, and she was lashed naked through the street by her injured husband.⁴

"Among the Gauls," says Strabo, "the occupations of the two sexes are distributed in a manner opposite to that which obtains among us. The cultivation of the land and a life of drudgery were imposed on wives, whilst the husbands devoted their time to war-like pursuits."⁵

Aristotle justly boasts that, in Greece, woman was not degraded to the level of a slave, as in Asia.⁶ But it must be added that, if she was not treated as a slave, she was regarded as a minor. She was under a perpetual tutelage, first to her father, who disposed of her for a price; next, to her husband; and, lastly, in her widowhood, to her sons. Even if she had no sons, she was not free; for her husband could appoint a guardian to succeed him after death. The Greek wife lived in almost entire seclusion, she and

¹ Döllinger, *The Gentile and the Jew*, I., p. 407.

³ Cæsar, *Comment.*, I., v.

⁵ B. IV., p. 66.

² B. I., No. 215.

⁴ German., ch. xix.

⁶ *Politic.*, I., l. 5.

her husband occupying separate parts of the house. She never went abroad unless accompanied by a female slave; she received no male visitors in the absence of her husband, and she was not permitted even to eat at her own table when male guests were present; she was denied the luxury of a polite education, her instruction being usually confined to the most necessary household duties, and to a limited knowledge of music and dancing, which was afforded her, not for the entertainment of herself and family, but to enable her to take part in certain religious festivals.

The domestic life of Greece, it is true, was founded on monogamy. But whilst the law restricted the husband to one wife as his helpmate and domestic guardian, it tolerated and even sanctioned the *hetairai*, who bore to him the relation of inferior wives, and who enjoyed his society more frequently and received more homage from him than his lawful spouse.¹ And whilst the education of the wife was of a most elementary character, the greatest care was lavished in cultivating the minds of the *hetairai*, that they might entertain their paramour by their wit while they fascinated him by their charms. The wife was the beast of burden; the mistress was the petted and pampered animal. These *hetairai* derived additional importance from being legally chosen to offer sacrifice on certain public occasions. This demoralizing system, so far from being deplored, was actually defended and patronized by statesmen, philosophers, and leaders of public opinion, such as Demosthenes, Pericles, Lysias, Aristotle, and Epicurus.

Solon erects in Athens a temple to Venus, the goddess of impure love. Greece is full of such temples, whilst there is not one erected to chaste, conjugal love.² No virtuous woman has ever left a durable record in the history of Greece.

The husband could put away his wife according to his capricious humor, and take a fairer, younger, and richer bride. He could dissolve the marriage bond without other formality than an attestation in writing before the archon; and the wife had practically no power to refuse, as she was completely under the dominion of her husband. She was a mere chattel, marketable at will; nor had she any power to dissolve the marriage without her husband's consent.

Such is the dark but truthful picture of woman exhibited before us in the most polished nation of Pagan antiquity. Now, the sport of man's passions; soon after, she is the victim of his irresponsible hatred. Denied access to her own table in the presence of strangers, she leads a dreary, monotonous life in the society of her slaves. Her very position of wife debars her from a refined edu-

¹ "The Gentile and the Jew," II., 235 *et seq.*

² Bossuet, *Hist. Univer.*, p. 198.

cation, which is sedulously bestowed on the mistress. She is doomed to a life of domestic bondage; the other enjoys the widest liberty. How can she give her heart to her husband, since she sees his affections divided among usurping rivals? Conjugal love must be reciprocal. She does not reign as queen and mistress of her household, but serves as a tenant at will. Her wishes are not consulted about her marriage or her divorce. Should her husband precede her to the grave, her condition is not improved.

In a word, the most distinguished Greek writers treat woman with undisguised contempt; they describe her as the source of every evil to man. One of their poets said that marriage brings but two happy days to the husband—the day of his espousals and the day on which he lays his wife in the tomb.

Hesiod calls women “an accursed brood, and the chief scourge of the human race.” The daily prayer of Socrates was a thanksgiving to the gods that he was born neither a slave nor a woman. And we have only to glance at the domestic life of Turkey to-day to be convinced that woman fares no better under modern Mohammedanism than she did in ancient Greece.

The Mohammedan husband has merely to say to his wife: “Thou art divorced,” and the bond is dissolved. To his followers Mohammed allowed four wives; to himself an unlimited number was granted by a special favor of Heaven.

The moral standard of the Lacedæmonian wives was far lower than that of the Athenians. They were taught, when maidens, to engage in exercises that strengthened the body and imparted grace to their movements, but at the sacrifice of female modesty. The idea of conjugal fidelity was not seriously entertained. Adultery was so common that it was scarcely regarded as a crime. Aristotle says that the Spartan wives lived in unbridled licentiousness.¹

Passing from Greece to Italy, we find that monogamy was, at least nominally, upheld in Rome, especially during the earlier days of the Republic. But, while the wife was summarily punished for the violation of the marriage vows, the husband's marital transgressions were committed with impunity.

Toward the end of the Republic, and during the Empire, the disorders of nuptial life increased to an alarming extent. There was a fearful rebound on the part of Roman wives, particularly among the upper classes, from the restraints of former days to the most unlimited license. They rivalled the wantonness of the sterner sex. So notorious were their morals, in the time of Augustus, that men preferred the unfettered life of celibacy to an alliance with partners bereft of every trace of female virtue. The strict

¹ Apud Döllinger, “The Gentile and the Jew,” II., 236. Plutarch's *Lives*, *Lycurgus*.

form of marriage became almost obsolete, and a laxer one, destitute of religious or civil ceremony, and resting solely on mutual agreement, became general. Each party could dissolve the marriage-bond at will and under the most trifling pretext, and both were free to enter at once into second wedlock.

Marriage was, accordingly, treated with extreme levity. Cicero repudiated his wife Terentia, that he might obtain a coveted dowry with another; and he discarded the latter, because she did not lament the death of his daughter by the former. Cato was divorced from his wife Attilia after she had borne him two children, and he transferred his second wife to his friend Hortensius, after whose death he married her again. Augustus compelled the husband of Livia to abandon her, that she might become his own wife. Sempronius Sophus was divorced from his wife, because she went once to the public games without his knowledge. Paulus Æmilius dismissed his wife, the mother of Scipio, without any reason whatever. Pompey was divorced and remarried a number of times. Sylla repudiated his wife during her illness, when he had her conveyed to another house.¹

If moral censors, philosophers, and statesmen, such as Cato, Cicero, and Augustus, discarded their wives with so much levity, how lax must have been the marriage-bond among the humble members of society, with examples so pernicious constantly before their eyes!

Wives emulated husbands in the career of divorces. Martial speaks of a woman who had married her tenth husband.² Juvenal refers to one who had had eight husbands in five years.³ St. Jerome declares that there dwelt in Rome a wife who had married her twenty-third husband, she being his twenty-first wife.⁴ "There is not a woman left," says Seneca, "who is ashamed of being divorced, now that the most distinguished ladies count their years not by the consuls, but by their husbands."⁵

II.

The world is governed more by ideals than by ideas; it is influenced more by living, concrete models than by abstract principles of virtue.

The model held up to Christian women is not the Amazon, glorying in her martial deeds and prowess; it is not the Spartan woman, who made female perfection consist in the development of physical strength at the expense of feminine decorum and modesty; it is not the goddess of impure love, like Venus, whose votaries

¹ Plutarch's *Life of Seneca*.

³ *Sat.*, VI., 30.

⁴ *Ep.*, 2.

² *Epig.*, VI., 7.

⁵ *De Benef.*, III., 14.

regarded beauty of form and personal charms as the highest type of female excellence; nor is it the goddess of imperious will, like Juno. No; the model held up to woman from the very dawn of Christianity is the peerless Mother of our Blessed Redeemer.

She is the pattern of virtue alike to maiden, wife, and mother. She exhibits the virginal modesty becoming the maid, the conjugal fidelity and loyalty of the spouse, and the untiring devotedness of the mother.

The Christian woman is everywhere confronted by her great model. Mary's portrait gazes down upon her from the wall. Her name is repeated in the pages of the book before her. Her eulogy is pronounced from the pulpit. Altars and temples are dedicated in her honor. Festivals are celebrated in her praise. In a word, the Virgin Mother is indelibly stamped on the intellect, the heart, the memory, and the imagination of the Christian daughter.

The influence of Mary, therefore, in the moral elevation of woman can hardly be overestimated. She is the perfect combination of all that is great, and good, and noble in Pagan womanhood, with no alloy of degradation.

Hers is exquisite beauty, but a beauty more of the soul than of the body; it delights without intoxicating. The contemplation of her excites no inward rebellion, as too often happens with Grecian models. She is the mother of fair love devoid of sickly sentimentality or sensuality.

In her we find force of will without pride or imperiousness. We find in her moral strength and heroism without the sacrifice of female grace and honor—a heroism of silent suffering rather than of noisy action. What Spartan mother ever displayed so much fortitude as Mary exhibited at the foot of the cross?

It seems to me that some writers are disposed to lay undue stress on the amiable and tender qualities of Mary and of holy Christian women without dwelling sufficiently on the strong and robust points of their character. The Holy Scripture in one place pronounces a lengthened eulogy on woman. What does the Holy Ghost especially admire in her? Not her sweet and amiable temper or her gentle disposition, though of course she possessed these virtues, for no woman is perfect without them. No; He admires her valor, courage, fortitude, and the sturdy virtue of self-reliance. He does not say: "Who shall find a gentle woman?" but rather: "Who shall find a valiant woman? As things brought from afar and from the uttermost coasts is the price of her."¹ It is only heroic virtues or virtues practised in a heroic degree that the Church canonizes.

¹ Prov., xxxi.

In every age the Church abounds in women immeasurably surpassing in sturdy virtue the highest types of Pagan female excellence. What woman of ancient Greece or Rome can exhibit evidences of moral strength so sublime as have been manifested in the lives of an Agnes, an Agatha, or a Cecilia, who suffered death rather than tarnish their souls? of a Felicitas and a Symphorosa, who encouraged their sons to endure torments and death rather than renounce their faith, and who shared also in their glorious martyrdom? Pagan history furnishes no instance of motherly devotedness comparable to the strong and tender love of Monica, who traversed land and sea that she might restore her son to a life of virtue.

Every impartial student of history is forced to admit that woman is indebted to the Catholic religion for the elevated station she enjoys to-day in family and social life.

We may recall in what contempt woman was held by the leading minds of Greece. She was kept in perpetual bondage or unending tutelage; she was regarded as the slave and the instrument of man's passions, rather than his equal and companion, by nearly every nation of antiquity; and she is still so regarded in all countries where Christianity does not prevail.

The Catholic Church, following the maxims of the Gospel and of St. Paul, proclaims woman the peer of man in origin and destiny, in redemption by the blood of Christ, and in the participation of His spiritual gifts. "Ye are all," says the Apostle, "the children of God by faith which is in Christ Jesus. . . . There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither servant nor freeman; there is *neither male nor female*."¹ The meaning is that in the distribution of His gifts God makes no distinction of person or sex. He bestows them equally on bond and free, on male and female. And as woman's origin and destiny are the same as man's, so is her dignity equal to his. As both were redeemed by the same Lord and as both aspire to the same heavenly inheritance, so should they be regarded as of equal rank on earth; as they are partakers of the same spiritual gifts, so should they share alike the blessings and prerogatives of domestic life.

In the mind of the Church, however, equal rights do not imply that both sexes should engage promiscuously in the same pursuits, but rather that each sex should discharge those duties which are adapted to its physical constitution and sanctioned by the canons of society.

To some among the gentler sex the words *equal rights* have been, it is to be feared, synonymous with *similar rights*. It was no

¹ Gal. iii., 26-28.

doubt owing to this misapprehension of terms that the attempt was made, not so very long ago, by some of the strong-minded fair, to introduce the glories of the Bloomer costume. But though the attempt proved a failure, the spirit that impelled it still survives, as may be seen by the various masculine modifications that have crept into female dress during the past few years. Where is the flowing and graceful drapery of former days that jealously shielded the modest wearer from gaze on the public street? Is it because the woman of to-day has laid aside what she looks upon as the cumbersome style of her grandmother's time that she aims at dauntlessly presenting herself at the ballot-box to cast in her suffrage for *A* or for *B*? Only a few years ago it provoked laughter to hear that Miss Jemima Snarl was to lecture on "Woman's Rights," or that Dr. Mary Walker had appeared on Broadway in male habiliments *cap-à-pie*. But now it is quite ordinary to hear of ladies, gentlewomen, daughters of some of our country's best men, not, indeed, imitating Dr. Mary Walker's exceptionable attire, but mounting the rostrum to harangue their audiences on the power of the "Faith Healers" or the merits of the "Salvation Army." Is it any wonder that a feeling of sadness creeps over one that such things should be? Fancy a fragile, highly-cultured lady starting up from her drawing-room surroundings at the alarm of fire, rushing to the scene of action, mounting a ladder, axe in hand; or her delicate fingers at play on the engine instead of the light guitar, while her ears are assailed by the coarse language of the motley crowd whose duty or pleasure it is to frequent such places?

To debar woman from such pursuits, is not to degrade her. To restrict her field of action to the gentler avocations of life, is not to fetter her aspirations after the higher and the better. It is, on the contrary, to secure to her not *equal* rights so-called, but those supereminent rights that cannot fail to endow her with a sacred influence in her own proper sphere; for, as soon as woman trenches on the domain of man, she must not be surprised to find that the reverence once accorded her has been in part, or wholly, withdrawn.

But it was by vindicating the unity, the sanctity, and the indissolubility of marriage that the Church has conferred the greatest boon on the female sex. The holiness of the marriage bond is the palladium of woman's dignity, while polygamy and divorce involve her in bondage and degradation.

The Church has ever maintained, in accordance with the teachings of our Saviour, that no man can lawfully have more than one wife, and no woman more than one husband. The rights and obligations of both consorts are correlative. To give to the husband the license of two or more wives would be an injustice to his spouse and destructive of domestic peace. The Church has also

invariably taught that the marriage compact, once validly formed, can be dissolved only by death; for what God hath joined together man cannot put asunder. While admitting that there may be a legitimate cause for separation, she never allows any pretext for the absolute dissolution of the marriage bond. For so strong and violent are the passion of love and its opposite passion of hate, so insidious is the human heart, that once a solitary pretext is admitted for absolute divorce, others are quickly invented, as experience has shown; thus a fearful crevice is made in the moral embankment, and the rush of waters is sure to override every barrier that separates a man from the object of his desires.

It has, again and again, been alleged that this law is too severe, that it is harsh and cruel, and that it condemns to a life of misery two souls who might find happiness if permitted to have their marriage annulled and to be united with more congenial partners. Every law has its occasional inconveniences, and I admit that the law absolutely prohibiting divorce *à vinculo* may sometimes appear rigorous and cruel. But its harshness is mercy itself when compared with the frightful miseries resulting from the toleration of divorce. Its inconvenience is infinitesimal when contrasted with the colossal evils from which it saves society and the solid blessings it secures to countless homes. Those exceptional ill-assorted marriages would become more rare if the public were convinced, once for all, that death alone can dissolve the marriage bond. They would then use more circumspection in the selection of a conjugal partner. Hence it happens that in Catholic countries where faith is strong, as in Ireland and the Tyrol, divorces are almost unheard of.

The enforcement of this law has been maintained by the Church against fearful odds, and has caused her many a mortal struggle. For if the strong government of the United States, with military forces at its command, with the sympathy of public opinion and Christian traditions on its side, is successfully resisted by a colony of Mormons, how violent must have been the opposition to the Church and how hopeless her task, humanly speaking, when physical force and inveterate custom were arrayed against her, and when she had on her side only moral power and spiritual penalties.

In vindicating the sanctity of marriage, the Church had to contend with a triple enemy—the fierce passions of barbarous tribes, the arbitrary power of princes, and the compromising spirit of rebellious churchmen.

From the fifth to the eighth century Europe was periodically visited by warlike tribes from the shores of the Baltic, from Asia, and from Africa. They threatened the overthrow of the Christian religion, and, in the general upheaval of society, the landmarks of

Christian civilization were well-nigh swept away. The invading hosts were utter strangers to monogamy and the restraining maxims of the Gospel. But when the storm subsided, the voice of religion was heard in defence of female honor and the sanctity of marriage, and the triumphant barbarians voluntarily submitted to the yoke of the Gospel.

Virginal and conjugal chastity found still more formidable opponents among many of the petty princes and barons of the Middle Ages. Fortified in their castles and surrounded by submissive vassals, they recognized no power that thwarted their lust; they set the laws of the land at defiance; they intimidated the local clergy; they disregarded even the authority of the bishops. The only voice before which they trembled and which compelled them to surrender their prey, was the anathema of Rome.

What a sorry figure the so-called Reformers presented when the honor of woman was at stake, and what little protection she had to expect from them in the hour of trial! Luther, in his commentary on Genesis, says that he does not decide whether a man is or is not permitted to have several wives at once; yet we all know that he did decide the question by permitting the Landgrave of Hesse to have two wives at the same time, his brother reformer Melanchthon concurring in the decision. We know, also, how obsequious Cranmer was to Henry VIII. in sanctioning his divorce from Catherine. How different was the conduct of Pope Innocent III., who compelled the French king, Philip Augustus, to dismiss Agnes de Méranie, whom he had unlawfully married, and take back his lawful wife, Ingelburga of Denmark, whom he had discarded! And all know with what firmness Pius VII., in the present century, refused to dissolve the marriage of Jerome Bonaparte with Elizabeth Patterson.

The Protestant Bishop of Maine makes the following candid avowal: "Laxity of opinion and teaching on the sacredness of the marriage bond and on the question of divorce *originated among the Protestants* of Continental Europe in the sixteenth century. It soon began to appear in the legislation of Protestant States on that Continent, and nearly at the same time to affect the laws of New England. From that time to the present it has proceeded from one degree to another in this country, until, especially in New England and in States most directly affected by New England opinions and usages, the Christian conception of the nature and obligations of the marriage bond finds scarcely any recognition in legislation or in the prevailing sentiment of the community."¹ In confirmation of this statement, it may be remarked that, according to the latest census, there was one divorce to every eight mar-

¹ Quoted from "The Calling of a Christian Woman," by Rev. Morgan Dix.

riages in Ashtabula County, Ohio, which is the focus of the Western Reserve, a colony founded by New England settlers. Had the indissoluble character of the marriage bond not already taken so deep and firm a hold upon the heart and conscience of Europe at the time of the "Reformation," it would have been uprooted by the storm of licentiousness aroused by the teaching and practice of the "Reformers."

What woman can calmly reflect on these facts without blessing the Catholic Church as, under God, the saviour of her sex? If virginal and conjugal chastity is held to-day as the brightest gem in the diadem of woman; if the wife is regarded as the peer of her husband, and not as his slave, the toy of his caprice and passion, as are the wives of Asiatic nations; if she is honored as the mistress of her household, and not looked upon as a tenant at will, as were the wives of Greece and Rome; if she is respected as the queen of the domestic kingdom, to be dethroned only by death, and not treated as the victim of rival queens, like the Mohammedan and Mormon wives, she is indebted to the Church which always held inviolate the unity and indissolubility of marriage, and especially to the Roman Pontiffs who never failed to enforce those fundamental laws.

And if woman has been elevated and ennobled by the Gospel, she has not been ungrateful for the boon conferred; she merits the eternal gratitude of the Christian world for the influence she has zealously exerted and is still exerting in behalf of religion and society. It is fearful to contemplate what would have become of our Christian civilization without the aid of the female sex. Not to speak of the grand army of consecrated virgins who are fanning the flame of faith and charity throughout the world, how many thousands of homes are there in our country from which God withholds His avenging hand, and to which He shows mercy, solely on account of a pious mother or daughter, just as He was willing to show mercy to Sodom for the sake of a few righteous souls, as He restored life to the young man borne to the tomb, for the sake of his mother, the widow of Naim! How many brothers, who had been long since buried in the grave of sin, are brought back to a life of virtue through the intercession of a pious sister, just as Lazarus was raised from the dead by the prayers and tears of Mary and Martha! How many daughters keep alive the spark of religion, which otherwise would be utterly extinguished, in many a household! How many are in their families angels of expiation, atoning by their prayers and mortification for the sins of fathers and sons!

Women, it is true, are debarred from the exercise of the public ministry and the celebration of the Sacred Mysteries, for they are

commanded by the Apostle to "keep silence in the churches."¹ But if they are not apostles by preaching, they are apostles by prayer, by charity, and by good example. If they cannot offer up the Sacrifice of the Mass, they are priests in the broader sense of the term; for they offer up in the sanctuary of their own homes and on the altar of their heart the acceptable sacrifice of supplication, praise, and thanksgiving to God. Viewing, then, woman's dignity and her work in the cause of Christ, well may we apply to her these words of the Prince of the Apostles: "You are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people."²

But if we glory in the preëminence that woman has attained under Christian civilization, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that her moral dignity is seriously compromised in many portions of our country by the lax legislation which assails the sanctity of marriage and threatens the very existence of family life. The cancer of divorce is rapidly spreading over the community and poisoning the fountains of the nation; unless the evil is checked by some speedy and heroic remedy, we shall not have much to boast of in comparison with Rome under the Empire, and shall have little left of Christianity except the name. How can we call ourselves a Christian people if we violate the fundamental principle of Christianity? And if the sanctity of marriage does not constitute a cardinal principle of the Christian religion, we are at a loss to know what does.

We cannot view without alarm the enormous increase of divorces legally obtained in this country.

The following figures represent the proportion of divorces to marriages in the six New England States for 1878:³

In Massachusetts, the ratio was	1	divorce for every	21	marriages.
In Vermont,	"	"	1	" " 13 "
In Rhode Island,	"	"	1	" " 10 "
In New Hampshire,	"	"	1	" " 10 "
In Connecticut,	"	"	1	" " 10 "
In Maine,	"	"	1	" " 8 "

The average proportion, therefore, of divorces to marriages in all the New England States was 1 to 12. Now two important facts have to be borne in mind, which give a still darker coloring to this gloomy picture: 1st, In the aggregate number of marriages, are included those of Catholics, who do not seek divorce, and the members of the Catholic Church may be roughly set down as forming one-fourth of the entire population. This will put the ratio of divorces to marriages at 1 to 8. 2d. The relative increase

¹ I. Cor., xiv. 34.

² I. Peter, ii. 9.

³ These statistics are condensed from Rev. Dr. Dix's admirable work, "The Calling of a Christian Woman."

of divorces over the general increase of the population in those States since 1878 safely warrants the conclusion that, at the present time, there is one divorce for every six marriages outside the Catholic Church.

Let the imagination picture to itself the fearful wrecks daily caused by this rock of scandal, and the number of families that are thus cast homeless on the world. Great stress is justly laid by moralists on the observance of the Sunday, and there are few things more creditable to our country than the quiet that reigns throughout the land on the Christian Sabbath. But what a mockery is this external peace to homes in which domestic peace is destroyed by intestine war, where the mother's heart is broken, the father's spirit is crushed, the family ties are dissolved, and the children cannot cling to one of their parents without exciting the hatred of the other.

This social plague calls for a radical cure; and the remedy can be found only in the abolition of our mischievous legislation regarding divorce, and in an honest application of the teachings of the Gospel.

The tendency to imitate the social depravity of Rome in the worst days of the Empire is not confined to the practice of divorce; it extends also to the neglect of maternal training.

In Pagan Rome, especially under the Cæsars, the wife was frequently divorced not only from her husband, but also from her children. At a tender age they were withdrawn from the care of their natural guardian, and consigned to the custody of slaves, who commonly combined refinement of culture with refinement of immorality. Nothing contributed more than this vicious system to debauch the Roman youth of both sexes.

How many mothers are now to be seen, especially in the higher walks of life, who are so much absorbed by the frivolities and fashions of the times, as to be utterly regardless of the responsibilities of maternity. Reared themselves, perhaps, without order or discipline, the mothers transmit to their children the legacy of anarchy and misrule which they had inherited from their parents. They treat their offspring like pet animals devoid of moral sense; they indulge them in every whim and fancy without inculcating any idea of duty and restraint.

Their great aim is to emancipate themselves as soon as possible from the personal charge of their children, which they regard as an intolerable drudgery, and to pass them over to the hands of strangers. Happily for the children, the nurses and teachers to whom they are consigned are often models of Christian virtue. But this circumstance does not extenuate the mother's delinquency, nor exonerate her from the obligation of personal supervision. A

mother may be aided indeed by other teachers in the education of her children, but never supplanted. The education of the young should begin at the mother's knee. The mind of a child, like softened wax, receives with ease the first impressions, which are always the deepest and most enduring. "A young man according to his way, even when he is old, he will not depart from it."¹ A child is susceptible of instruction much earlier in life than parents generally imagine. Mothers should watch with a jealous eye the first unfolding of the infant mind, and pour into it the seed of heavenly knowledge.

For various reasons the mother should be the first instructor of her children:

1st. As nature ordains that the mother should be the first to feed her offspring with her own substance, so does God ordain that she should be the first to impart to her little ones the "rational milk" whereby they "may grow unto salvation."²

2d. Those children that are nurtured by their own mother are usually more healthy and robust than those that are nursed by strangers. In like manner they that are instructed by their own mother in the principles of Christian piety, are usually more robust in faith than those that have been guided exclusively by other teachers.

3d. It cannot be doubted that maternal and filial affections are mutually nurtured by the closer and intimate relations that mother and child have with each other, while these affections are chilled by a prolonged separation.

4th. The more confidence a child has in its preceptor, the more he is apt to advance in learning. Now, in whom does a child confide more implicitly than in his mother? In every danger he flies to her as to an ark of safety; he will place the utmost reliance on what she says. The mother should not lose the golden opportunity of instructing her children in faith and morals while their hearts are open to receive her every word.

5th. Lastly, the mother occupies the same house with her children, frequently the same apartment, and eats at the same table with them. She is the visible guardian-angel of her children. She is therefore the best calculated to instruct them, as she can avail herself of every little circumstance that presents itself to draw from it a moral lesson.

Let Christian mothers recognize their sublime mission. Let them bear in mind that to them is confided the most tender portion of the flock of Christ, which on that account should be watched with the greater care. On them devolves the duty of directing the

¹ Prov., xxii. 6.

² I. Peter, ii. 2.

susceptible and pliant minds of their children, and of instilling into their youthful hearts the principle of piety. It is theirs to plant the seed of the word of God in the virgin soil, and, when a more experienced hand is required to cultivate it, the ministers of God will not be wanting in developing its growth.

We would exhort mothers in the name of the holy religion they profess; in the name of their country, which expects them to rear not scourges of society, but honorable and law-abiding members; in the name of God, who requires them to have their offspring fed with the nourishment of sound doctrine; we beg them, in the name of their own eternal salvation and that of the souls committed to their charge, to provide for their children *at home* a healthy, moral, and religious education. "If any one have not care of his own, and especially of those of his house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."¹

And, then, what a source of consolation it will be to them in their declining years when they reflect that they will leave after them children who will inherit not only their name, but also their faith and virtues. They will share in the beautiful eulogy pronounced by the Holy Ghost on the mother of the family: "Who shall find a valiant woman? . . . She hath opened her mouth to wisdom, and the law of clemency is on her tongue. She hath looked well to the paths of her house, and hath not eaten her bread idle. Her children rose up and called her blessed; her husband, and he praised her. Many daughters have gathered together riches; thou hast surpassed them all. Favor is deceitful and beauty is vain: the woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised."²

¹ Tim., v. 8.

Prov., xxxi.

THE COMING CONFLICT IN THE EAST.

WHAT has lately taken place in Bulgaria could hardly fail to attract considerable attention throughout the world, because not only diplomatic circles, but cultured society at large, couple these occurrences—and quite properly so—with a reappearance of the Eastern Question on the political horizon of Europe.

The abduction of Prince Alexander of Battenberg from his palace in Sofia during the dark of night, his transportation on a yacht to Reni, the counter revolution while he was on his way to Darmstadt, his triumphant return into Bulgaria, and subsequent abdication as ruler,—all these events took place with a rapidity truly characteristic of our age. They read like a romantic tale, and partake of a genuine dramatic character; but they are none the less real. And while they remind us, pleasantly, on the one hand, that even in this thoroughly materialistic century loyalty and patriotism have not completely died out, they open up, on the other hand, a vista into the future which fills observant minds with uneasy forebodings.

Perhaps a “*modus vivendi*” will be found to patch up once more, for a time at least, a truce; yet the final solution of the Oriental problem can hardly be postponed much longer. And this final solution, whenever it comes, involves, as is admitted by the diplomatic world of Europe, nearly all the great powers, and hence will be a struggle of gigantic proportions. It is by no means an exaggeration to say that nearly all the powers interested have been preparing themselves for this struggle for years, and this leads us to incline to the belief that we are on the eve of the day when matters will be settled in a conclusive way, and the map of southeastern Europe and Asia completely re-arranged. Indications to that effect are not wanting. It is impossible to dissociate the closing of Batoum, as a port of free entry, by Russia, contrary to the provisions of the treaty of Berlin, and the establishment of a coaling station on the island of Thasos, in the Ægean Sea, by England, from the troubles in Bulgaria. Nor is it at all possible not to attach any significance to the fact that both Russia and Austria have this year chosen for the autumn manœuvres on a large scale, which are now being held annually by every great military power, districts which, in the event of hostilities in the future, could not fail to form part of the theatre of war. If this choice of ground for sham battles was, as some contend, purely accidental, it is a very singular coincidence, to say the least; but in the opinion of keen

observers of current events, this choice of territory is not devoid of a deeper meaning. And so it would be easy to multiply the instances which furnish cumulative evidence that the pulse of Europe beats rather feverishly in anticipation of the momentous issues which the near future may disclose.

It is hardly necessary to remark that personally Prince Alexander, howsoever much he be surrounded with a halo of military glory and lofty sentiments, does not enter at all into the consideration of the Great Powers. Nor is even the fate of those long-suffering and downtrodden nationalities of the southeast of Europe, which began to feel the throb of national life only within the last few decades, the cause of serious apprehensions for the future. While it is undeniable that the Bulgarians, Servians, Roumanians, etc., are very deeply interested in the final outcome, they realize themselves that the decision rests not with them, but with the Great Powers, in whose hands they play pretty much the same rôle as the figures on a chessboard in the hands of the players. A discussion of Bulgarian affairs throws, consequently, at best only a feeble side light upon the situation. For a full and comprehensive understanding of the real issue, it seems to us indispensable to ascertain what lies beyond and behind the apparent complications. And since a brief historical review, going back as far as 1853, will go far towards elucidating what is at stake and why it is so, we will briefly summarize, first, what took place in the southeast of Europe within that period, and next, what changes were wrought in the situation in Central Europe.

In 1853, prior to the beginning of the Crimean war, Czar Nicholas I. laid down the political creed of Russia in regard to her foreign policy, in certain overtures made by him to the then English Ambassador at St. Petersburg, Sir Hamilton Seymour. Inasmuch as Russia has persistently from that time on endeavored to carry out the plans outlined in these overtures, it may not be superfluous to state, in a condensed form, their main propositions: Russia, first of all, desired to establish Servia, Bosnia, Bulgaria, and the so-called Danubian Principalities (Moldavia and Wallachia, now known as Roumania) as states independent of the Porte, but *subject to Russian protection*, and proposed a temporary occupation of Constantinople, in order to facilitate the obtaining of, or rather to enforce, the consent of the Porte to this arrangement, *i. e.*, loss of territory. In consideration of England's acquiescence in these plans of Russia, Russia's consent to the acquisition of Crete and Egypt by England was promised. At the same time a direct and peremptory demand was made by Nicholas I. through Prince Menchikow, the Russian Ambassador accredited to Constantinople, that the Porte recognize a Russian protectorate over all the Christian subjects of the Sultan within

the dominions of the Ottoman Empire. The failure of the British Government to favorably entertain Emperor Nicholas' proposal, and the Sultan's firmness in upholding his authority, rendered it desirable for Russia to strengthen her hands otherwise. The interview of September, 1853, at Olmütz, between the Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria, the King of Prussia, and Czar Nicholas, was arranged, therefore, by the latter, with a view of securing an alliance of these powers against the probable coalition of the western powers, namely, France and England. Russia failed, however, to obtain more than a very conditional pledge of neutrality.

The Crimean war followed. Emperor Nicholas died during the siege of Sebastopol by the allied forces, and bequeathed to his successor, Alexander II., the carrying out of what may not inaptly be called his political testament. How, after a most stubborn resistance, the taking by assault of the Malakof by the French, under Pellissier, and of the Redan by the English, under Lord Raglan, in September, 1855, decided the fall of Sebastopol, and thereby the campaign against Russia, is well known. Diplomatic negotiations were opened, and led to the conclusion of the Peace of Paris, on March 30th, 1856. By its provisions Russia's ambition suffered a serious check. Moldavia and Wallachia, the so-called Danubian Principalities, were indeed united as Roumania, under Prince Charles of Hohenzollern, but as a suzerainty of the Porte. This defeat of Russian schemes served, however, in no way to induce the Government of St. Petersburg to abandon them. On the contrary, Russian money and Russian intrigues have continued ever since to cause disturbances, in order to create opportunities for carrying out her schemes. The uprising against Turkish misrule in the Herzegovina, in 1875, fomented by Russian money, led, after an unsuccessful conference at Berlin, to a declaration of war on the part of Servia and Montenegro against the Porte. Russia espoused quite openly the cause of Servia; but in spite of Russian aid and Russian officers in the ranks of the Servian army, victory remained with the Turks. Montenegro fought more successfully. In the meantime Sultan Abdul-Aziz had been superseded by Murad V., who, in turn, in August of the same year, was followed by Abdul-Hamid II. A six months' truce was followed in March, 1877, by the conclusion of peace between Servia and the Porte, on the basis of the "*status quo ante*." Anxious for a palpable cause for direct intervention, Russian agents had, during that time, incited an insurrection in Bulgaria, the quelling of which, in 1876, was entrusted by the Sultan to the Turkish militia. The cruelties perpetrated by the Bashi-Bozhuks, though often but retaliations, were made the most of by Russia, and, skillfully reported all over Europe, created a general and quite just outburst of indignation against Moslem misrule throughout civil-

ized Christendom. The plenipotentiaries of the several powers met in December at Constantinople, and shortly afterwards a constitution was proclaimed for the Ottoman Empire. The Czar, however, in his rôle as protector of Christians, not satisfied with the provision made for the amelioration of the Christian subjects of the Porte in this constitution, declared war, in April, 1877, against Turkey. This memorable campaign, conspicuous by reason of a frightful loss of life and fighting of the fiercest character round Plevna and the Shipka pass, and ending, with the aid of the Roumanian army, in the signal defeat of Turkey, is an event of so recent date as to require but a cursory allusion. A truce of arms, concluded at Adrianople on January 31st, 1878, was followed, on March 3d, by the treaty of San Stefano, the main provisions of which instrument were: Territorial expansion of Servia and Montenegro and their recognition as independent states by the Porte, and a further recognition of Roumania's independence; the creation of Bulgaria as a new suzerain state, embracing Bulgaria proper as well as Eastern Roumelia; finally, cession to Russia of a large territory in Asia (Armenia), and in Europe of Bessarabia and the Dobrud-scha, the latter ceded by Russia to Roumania as compensation for the assistance rendered in the campaign. England protested at once against the provisions of this treaty, as a practical dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire; the Sultan, for the sake of obtaining England's guarantee to preserve intact the remaining Asiatic possessions of the Porte, ceded Cyprus to England. War between England and the Porte seemed imminent, when the mediation of Germany brought about the convening of the Congress at Berlin. Not since the days of the famous Congress at Vienna of 1815, after the Napoleonic wars, was there ever in this century assembled a galaxy of more distinguished statesmen and diplomats than on that occasion at Berlin (June 13th, 1878). Under the presidency of Prince Bismarck, the Chancellor of the German Empire, the deliberations were held and participated in by such men as Prince Gortschakoff, the Earl of Beaconsfield, Count Andrassy, and a host of lesser lights. The modifications of the Treaty of San Stefano referred principally to Bulgaria, whose suzerainty to the Porte, under Prince Alexander of Battenberg, was recognized, while its territorial extent was limited to Bulgaria proper, north of the Balkans. Eastern Roumelia remained a Turkish province, but under a Christian governor, while the administration of Bosnia, Herzegovina, and the Sandjack of Novi-Bazar was entrusted to Austria. The independence of Servia, Montenegro, and Roumania was ratified. Since then the union of Roumelia with Bulgaria, under Alexander, acquiesced in, at last, by the Porte, as well as by the Great Powers, and the war between this aggrandized Bul-

garia and Servia, in which Prince Alexander distinguished himself as a military leader, and won the hearts of the Bulgarians, are the latest events to be recorded in the southeast of Europe.

Condensed as this review is, it familiarizes us with the last thirty years' history of that part of Europe sufficiently for our purposes; and we will now proceed to review, in a still more condensed form, what changes have taken place in the balance of Europe. First of all, we observe that the leadership in the councils of the continental powers has passed from the hands of France into those of Germany. The French Empire no longer exists; a Republic has superseded it. Nor is the German Confederacy any longer in existence; in its place we encounter a strong, united Germany, under the venerable King of Prussia as its first Emperor, the result of a signal victory of the German forces over the French armies. As a further consequence of this victory, we notice, on the map of Europe, Alsace and Lorraine as German and not any more as French provinces. Again, turning to Austria, it forms no longer part of Germany; the Italian provinces, Lombardy and Venice, as a result of the war of 1866, have passed into the hands of Italy; Bosnia, Herzegovina, and the Sandjack of Novi-Bazar, though nominally still dependencies of the Porte, make up, however, in reality, to Austria for the loss of territory in Italy. Italy has one sovereign less. The Papal States had ceased to exist already, in 1860, but the "*Patrimonium Petri*," in its strict sense, continued up to 1870, when Rome and its territory were likewise annexed by the new Kingdom of Italy. The Pope, heretofore an independent sovereign, is, consequently, now only the "Prisoner of the Vatican." Italy is, moreover, recognized as the sixth great power. In Russia, the assassination of Alexander II. by the Nihilists put his son, Alexander III., on the throne, while in the Ottoman Empire Abdul Hamid II. still rules over largely dismembered dominions.

This, then, is the situation which a cursory glance at the history of the last thirty years discloses to us; and before proceeding any further, we think it proper to emphasize two very conspicuous facts: Russia's unflagging determination to carry out the political testament of Nicholas I., and, next, the not less determined opposition of the other European powers to Russia's doing so. Russia, it will be observed, appears throughout that period as the champion of the Cross against the Crescent; yet, owing to the political complications, Ottoman misrule found support all along against Russia. It is well to keep this paradoxical phenomenon in mind, as it will help to explain the attitude of several apparently more Christian states than Russia towards the Porte.

And now we propose to deal briefly with the several aspects under which the Eastern Question should be viewed. In the first

place, there are geographical, *i. e.*, political reasons, in the strictest sense, actuating the Powers to assume the respective attitudes which they now hold. Next, it is our office to inquire into the sociological status of the case, which will show us that two different phases exist. Lastly, it will devolve upon us to examine into the nature of the religious elements and their bearing upon the issue. For, as will be seen presently, the Eastern Question, from each of these points of view, presents us with different combinations, and hence with different possibilities; and unless they are all put into the scale and weighed against one another, no surmise of what will occur can offer us the promise of verification in the future.

In regard to the first point, a glance at a map shows that the Russian Empire covers nearly one-seventh of the whole land surface of the globe. Its population exceeds ninety millions—the great bulk of whom are of one and the same race, and speak, with slight variations of dialect, one and the same language. On the north, Russia's empire nearly belts the globe; on the west, she touches Sweden and Norway; on the east, her borders are conterminous with those of the largest continent, while she also touches China and menaces India over Khiva; on the south, Germany, Austria, the Danube, the Bosphorus, form her borders. The possibilities of expansion in Asia alone are truly enormous. From Manchou-ria, north of China, Russia could overawe and gradually absorb the Celestial Empire, while from the trans-Caucasian provinces she can without much difficulty extend her dominions over Persia, subjugate all Asia, north of India, up to the Indus on the east and to the Persian gulf, Arabia and the Mediterranean on the south. Russia could thus establish an empire larger than that founded by Ghengis-Khan, larger than that founded by the Saracens, larger, indeed, than any that ever existed. And with such a vast empire, aspirations for universal monarchy are, indeed, by no means incompatible. To this must be added the fact that Russia is a vast centralized power, animated by *a single spirit*, moved by *a single will*.

These purely geographical possibilities seem already to require, for the preservation of a European equilibrium of power, that Russia's dreams of universal monarchy be restrained, unless the whole of Europe is to become Cossack. From a political standpoint alone, it appears as if Russia intended now to dispute the hegemony of Europe with Germany. And here let it not be forgotten that Berlin lies on the road from St. Petersburg to Paris. Shall the Slav supplant the Teuton, as the Teuton has supplanted the Gaul? This is the political view of it!

And now let us turn to the sociological side of the problem. Here, it appears to us, if not necessary, at all events very advan-

tageous for a full comprehension of this side of the question, to make what may, at first, seem a digression from the subject. We seek an answer to the query, What is the stage at which modern civilized Europe has arrived? What is the main pursuit of the leading, that is to say, the most civilized and powerful nations? We naturally consult Mr. Herbert Spencer, the acknowledged father of modern sociology.

Our readers will perhaps remember that at the end of his visit to this country a number of gentlemen of unquestioned prominence tendered to the distinguished scientist a banquet in New York, and that on this occasion he delivered a post-prandial speech which has since become famous. It is, of course, foreign to the purpose of this paper to dwell upon the fund of instructive information which he succeeded in compressing within after-dinner remarks of a short half hour's duration. But let it be briefly stated that he asserted that the law of evolution regulates the life of nations, like the life of individuals, with an unrelenting sternness and regularity, so much so that the forces at work in the mysterious web of existence have become factors of science. The study of life shows, he contends, a shifting of the purposes of existence. Man's first ideal, he said, is "war," which for a time appears to be the summit of his aspirations. As the second ideal, Mr. Herbert Spencer enumerated "business." But he maintained of this second, as of the first, that after a lapse of time it is destined to give way, since it leads "to deterioration, and if pressed to its extreme limits, to death." Before the third ideal of life's energy he pauses; he says science can neither define it nor point it out.

Now let us try to understand these, at first sight, rather mysterious assertions. What is to be understood by man's first ideal being war and his second being business? After a little reflection, we are constrained to admit that Mr. Herbert Spencer, after all, is right. Within man's bosom, individually as well as collectively, there dwells an innate and ineradicable desire to rule, to govern, to possess, to be superior to others, to own and direct; and in the first stage of life, it is to physical force, that is to say, to *war*, that we apply for its assertion. And not until it is seen by experience that even the utmost success of force fails to satisfy human ambition, and that a measuring of physical force does not imply a corresponding ascendancy in any other line, not until then do nations rivet their attention upon the second ideal, "business." Under that term there is to be understood the acquisition of wealth, and power, and distinction, and prosperity, and happiness, not by the application of sheer brute force, but by a proper exercise of the intellectual powers. As soon as this stage is reached, war necessarily recedes from first to second place, and becomes henceforth

a means to an end, but ceases to serve as a primary object. Now that stage, Mr. Herbert Spencer affirms, is the stage that has at present been reached by the civilized world, and herein we fully agree with him. The history of all nations, their rise, their conquests, their migrations, their fall, their whole civic and political life, give unmistakable evidence that "war" and "business" in the above sense play the part of determining agencies. But let us not here forget that Mr. Herbert Spencer does not claim business as the best and highest ideal of mankind's pursuit; far from it, he claims it simply as the idol of worship of our times, and inasmuch as, according to his own admission, it is an ideal of insufficient value, that very fact will serve to explain those mistakes on the part of governments which arise from their being given up to the exclusive worship of that ideal.

To explain still more fully the meaning that should be attached to the term "business" as a nation's prime object of pursuit, it may not be amiss to call our readers' attention to a rather conspicuous phase of modern history, namely, the colonial policy of all advanced nations. Colonization schemes, whether crowned with success or ending in failure, are, as we all well know, not merely undertaken for the purpose of hoisting a flag over some semi-barbarous and perhaps very unhealthy country or island; a much deeper reason underlies such undertakings. If we ask, "why did England acquire India?" the only correct answer is and will ever be, "because a sound perception of the dictates of political economy made an expansion of empire highly desirable, if not necessary." To be sure, England's colonial policy was influenced by many factors, such as climate, territorial extent, geographical configuration, etc. Yet its true basis is only to be found in the fact that the inhabitants of the British isles, being a nation full of energy, enterprise, and indomitable perseverance, and finding impassable limitations surrounding agricultural pursuits, saw themselves compelled to devote their main energies to industries and commerce; hence success for them lay and was found only in the conversion of raw products of their own and other countries into manufactured articles demanded by others. That idea always did form, and still continues to form, the prime motive-power of the foreign policy of Great Britain. Thus, the East India Company led to the conquest of India, and ultimately to the establishment of an Indian Empire. The same reason forced England to purchase the controlling interest in the Suez Canal, so as to be able to preserve and protect her vast commerce with the East. Precisely the same motive actuated the acquisition of Cyprus, for without a coaling station in the eastern part of the Mediterranean, a fleet of ironclads would be impotent to afford any adequate protection to the British mer-

chant marine. And so "business" again compelled England to interest herself in the Afghan frontier dispute.

Russia, it can hardly be denied, has only begun to emerge from the first stage; she commences only to leave the state of semi-barbarous indolence and to enter upon the field of progress. Now the pursuit of the first ideal drove Russia to a gradual subjugation of tribe after tribe, and thus the eastern frontier was pushed further and further east toward India. The products of these newly acquired countries required an outlet, the overland route without railways being too costly and no adequate justification for railway construction as yet existing apart from military reasons. Without ports from which these products could be offered to the world's commerce, no proper advance, no participation in enriching trade, is even prospective. Such an outlet, moreover, should be open at all seasons and accessible to ships from all ports in the world. Before 1880 Russia had already realized that the acquisition of Constantinople, owing to the concerted opposition of all the great powers, was not a thing of the near future; on the other hand, the necessity for a maritime outlet asserted itself more and more, hence Russia's advance in Asia towards India in order to secure a port on the Persian gulf. Now, without a strong foothold near India England could easily dispute the freedom of such an outlet. And in this sense, and not as a threat to the security of the Indian Empire, are, in our opinion, the Russian operations on the Afghan frontier to be interpreted. England's and Russia's interests clash there, and moreover clash seriously, because there is no possibility of gain-saying the fact that with free access to the world's commerce Russia would soon appear as a competitor of England in the carrying trade of the world. Thus we perceive how the pursuit of "business" creates between these powers a necessary and unavoidable and irreconcilable enmity.

And if we turn to France and examine into her foreign policy in Tonquin, in Madagascar and on the North coast of Africa, we find "business" as previously defined to be the *raison d'être*, and so also with Germany. The quite recent and very decided movements of the German Chancellor to secure colonial outlets for the German Empire bear out, we trust, the correctness of Mr. Herbert Spencer's statement that "business" is indeed the ruling force of modern statesmanship. So we see that under the head of "business" Russia's schemes conflict to an alarming extent with many European powers.

And now we will proceed to deal briefly with the other sociological aspect of the situation. The Czar of Russia, of all European Sovereigns, presides alone over a nation which is still in the ascendancy, or may, at least, hope for a career of ascendancy. Outward

surroundings, as we have seen, rather than the conviction of experience, lead the Government at St. Petersburg to consult the "business" interests of the Empire. Regarded as a nation in the whole, the Slav element typified by Russia still strives after man's first ideal. The Italian and the Spaniard have passed the zenith long ago; the Celtic, the Gallic and the Teuton elements have also reached their summit; while the great Slav family still continues in its infancy. Over ninety millions obey the sway of one will and are willing to lay down life even for the cause of the Slavs. The idea of a vast Slav empire, carefully nurtured by the Czars, finds a responsive echo in the Ukraine and on the steppes of Tartary. Russia is the natural centre towards which all members of the Slavonic family gravitate. Upwards of sixteen millions of Slavs are now under Austrian rule; add to these the populations of Bulgaria, Roumania, Servia, Montenegro, Bosnia, Herzegovina, etc.; think of all these Slavs united under one sceptre, obeying one command, and Russia in Europe would reach down to the Ægæan sea, encircle Hungary, absorb Turkey and Austria, until Europe became but one vast Slav State. A new civilization, born in the Muscovite realm, would supersede that of Austria, Germany, France and England; and Europe stands aghast, as well she may, before the sweeping change this ascendant Slav element could effect, if remaining unchecked.

And now to the last aspect, the religious side of the question, the last reason why Europe can never consent to let Russia carry out her dreams. Russia couples with her temporal ambition a fanatical zeal for the Greek schism, and is determined to carry it wherever she goes and to make her national Church universal. The Czar aims to be Pope as well as Emperor, autocrat in spirituals as well as temporals, and Russian rule threatens, therefore, religious liberty, the basis and guarantee of all other liberties. A still more powerful Russia than she is at present would necessarily govern the politics, the commerce and, outside of the Catholic Church, the religion of Europe.

All these matters have to be taken into consideration for us to understand why it is, first, that the power of the Crescent in Europe has not long ago been broken; secondly, why the one Christian power which stood up as the champion of the Cross against the Crescent, and attempted to drive the latter from the Bosphorus in order to plant again the Cross on St. Sofia, has been prevented by other Christian powers from doing so; and, thirdly, why Ottoman misrule and oppression have not only been tolerated, but why the Porte has, indeed, found England's purse always open, and all powers more or less ready to give her support, moral, financial and physical, against the northern Colossus, her hereditary enemy.

This brief analysis discloses already how numerous and momentous are the issues involved in the Eastern Question. In one sense, all of Europe must be up in arms to prevent the Continent from falling a prey to Slav despotism. In another sense, the more advanced commercial nations encounter in Russia a dangerous rival in the pursuit of their own object, while Austria's very existence hinges upon its success in hindering the absorption of European Turkey and of the young Slav states in the southeast by Russia. In a third sense, modern civilization clamors to be upheld against religious despotism. And still the subject is not yet exhausted. For the Sick Man of Europe, the distribution of whose last effects causes so much alarm, harmless by himself as he now is, because considerably weakened, has so far been left out of our calculation. Now the Sultan, it must be remembered, unites in his person nearly the same prerogatives as the Czar. As Mahomet's successor, he is the ruler of all Moslems, and in the extremity of a last struggle for self-preservation the fanaticism of Mahometanism may rally round the unfurled flag of the Prophet all faithful professors of Islam. Bearing in mind that millions of the subjects of the Empress of India are followers of the Koran, the possibility of new complications from this source cannot be denied, howsoever remote the same may appear at present. Let us suppose for a moment that Russia will ally herself to Turkey, and that thus the Greek Church and Islamism confront European Christianity. What a formidable array of almost equal forces! In this multiplicity of forces that, under certain circumstances, may be brought into play, and in the uncertainty *when* and *where* they will assert themselves, lies one of the main difficulties of the Eastern Question.

Not many months ago there appeared in Paris a pamphlet, presumed to have been inspired by Prince Bismarck, which created quite a sensation by the ingenious solution it proposed for the Eastern Question. Conceding that the Turks had outlived their power in Europe, and conceding, further, that Constantinople could not be allowed to fall into the hands of any of the great powers, it suggested the neutralization of Constantinople and adjacent territory under an international guarantee, and offering it to the Pope as independent Sovereign, thus solving also the Roman problem. Without attaching any significance to this curious production, it goes, at all events, to show the intense anxiety for devising some way of finding a solution of the Eastern Question that might prove acceptable to all. But it offers, also, food for reflection in another direction, inasmuch as it indicates that whoever wrote that pamphlet recognized the fact that, sooner or later, the present abnormal position of the Pope must also be brought to an end. If real greatness possesses one distinctive characteristic, it is the readiness to

acknowledge a mistake, if one has been committed. We need not allude to the unparalleled bitterness with which the Iron Chancellor has fought the Papacy for years; the extreme measures to which he resorted are too well known. Yet, having recognized this hostile attitude towards Rome to be a grave mistake, Prince Bismarck has not been slow in endeavoring to undo the mischief wrought during his earlier administration of the affairs of Germany. It seems to us that the choice of Pope Leo XIII. to act as arbiter between Germany and Spain in the dispute over the Caroline Islands, the abolition of the Falk laws, and particularly the way in which Prince Bismarck himself advocated speedy measures of relief, furnish very conclusive evidence that Germany would be glad to see the Roman question adjusted. We take this conciliatory attitude of Germany towards the Church of Rome to indicate, however, even more. We believe that the astutest statesman of the age sees beyond Herbert Spencer as a third and final object of mankind's pursuit an ideal that is closely connected with the mission the Vicar of Christ has to carry out here below. And here we will once more, by way of parenthesis, revert to Mr. Herbert Spencer. We fully agreed with him, as stated before, that "war" constitutes man's first ideal, which is equal to saying that in the first stage of life the elements of physical nature predominate. Heroic virtues, courage, valor, prowess, etc., are and will be idolized by youth, until human nature ceases to be what it is; nor can hero-worship be satisfactorily explained in any other way. And this so-called sociological discovery is corroborated, moreover, by the teaching of sound religion; for the first office of religion is, we are told, the subduing of animal nature. And, as to the second ideal, "business," which means, as we tried to explain before, the application of the intellectual faculties to the same object for which, in the first stage, only physical nature, "force," was called into requisition, this proposition, again, in no way does violence to the teachings of true religion, since theologians tell us that after the conquest of animal nature comes the subjugation of the intellect. And, by pausing before the third ideal, particularly after the emphatic declaration that the first, like the second, is insufficient, Mr. Herbert Spencer simply proves his honesty as a scientist and the superiority of religion over science. He dispels, therefore, the phantom of hostility between the two, and exorcises forever that abiding terror of all timid and superficial minds. The German Chancellor, we think, goes one step further, and shares with us the belief that the things and events of this world do not occur blindly or irrelevantly, but are all, throughout the farthest sweep of illimitable space, connected together and are orderly manifestations of a divine power outside of ourselves, upon which we depend and

which reveals itself to us in every throb of the mighty rhythmic life of the nations. He holds, therefore, that the next step in the line of progress must consist in harmonizing "business" as well as "war" with the third and last object of man's pursuit, viz., "religion." Outside of the Church of Rome, this belief, if it exist at all, is still crude, shapeless, without vitalizing force, without life-giving energy. In our own opinion, however, the law of probabilities holds out the promise that, when that fresh-born science, sociology, is once risen from the cradle in which it still lies as a promising infant, when it will walk in the vigor of fully developed manhood, this science will then teach to generations still unborn that neither "war" nor "business" forms the complete ideal of mankind, but the strife after that divine life which secures, individually and socially, the most perfect attainable happiness. It will, then, be understood that, just as much as it is necessary to become master over animal nature, just so much is it also necessary to bring the intellect under the dominion and rule of that higher law which forms the foundation of all belief by giving to the slave of time and space, as the ultimate object, a life beyond this earth. If we discard narrowness of vision, and look on the hand of winged hope forward towards the future of the human race, we may well think of a day when a successor of Mr. Herbert Spencer, in a city not yet founded, may dwell in a postprandial speech upon the third ideal of life as revealed by sociology, not as a surmise, not as a prophecy, but as a well-attested fact.

True statesmanship will then no longer be confined to the proper coördination of the two ideals that first appear on the scene, but will be able, by integrating these two in the third, which in import surpasses the other two combined, to cope successfully with those problems which now defy solution. Prince Bismarck, we take it, with keen foresight discerns that the struggle will end in the survival of the fittest, and he is certainly the fittest who deals not with one, nor with two, but with all elements that must be taken into account to insure correct results. It is for this reason that, in our humble opinion, the restoration of the independency of the Pope as a Sovereign during the combat accompanying the solution of the Eastern Question appears as by no means an impossible contingency.

But, to return to what we are mainly concerned with in this paper. On what side, and for what reasons, will the various great powers be arrayed, what combinations may, with reasonable propriety, be expected to be made, and what will be the final outcome? These are the questions to which we will address ourselves now.

As regards the Ottoman Empire, we deem it as extremely

doubtful whether the half-dead body of the Sick Man of Europe can be galvanized into sufficient life and activity to serve another term as a bulwark against Muscovite ambition. No doubt, the Triple Alliance can, if it chooses, drop once more the curtain, and grant another lease of life to the Porte, but its duration cannot be long. The sacrifice of Prince Alexander to the Czar's explicit desire to have him removed from the throne of Bulgaria for no other reason than this, that his independent conduct, as ruler, rendered him a *persona ingrata*, indicates, on the part of Germany and Austria, a desire not to force the issue; and Russia's solemn pledge not to interfere in the internal affairs of Bulgaria savors strongly as if some delay were not unwelcome even to the Czar. Germany's action may, however, proceed from her desire to humor Russia as long as possible, so as to postpone, if not to frustrate, an alliance between France and Russia. Germany and Austria have identical interests in the East. Prince Bismarck knows well that Russian ownership of the Balkan peninsula means the end of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. For the last ten years every effort has been made to alienate, as much as possible, the sympathies of the new Slav States from Russia, and affiliate them to the Austrian monarchy, and the relations between the governments of Roumania, Servia, and even Bulgaria, and their rulers, on the one hand, and the two empires of central Europe are far more cordial than those of Russia to either of the southeastern States. What is for Austria a question of existence in the immediate future, is for Germany a question of existence at a future date. With this difference, their interests are the same. The necessity of a counterpoise to Russia in the southeast of Europe is recognized not only by them, but by the other great powers likewise. The gradual dismemberment of Turkey has rendered the Porte too weak to serve as such counterweight. Thus, the only way to prevent Russia from carrying out her aggressive policy in Europe, is to create a new power. This may be done in two ways. The formation of a confederacy of Balkan states under the leadership of Austria, similar to the now existing relationship between the several German states forming that empire, suggests itself as by no means improbable. Neither France nor England could offer any serious objections, and Russia's reluctant consent to such an arrangement might temporarily be secured by giving her free hand in Afghanistan and Asia in general, an eventuality which could not fail to bring about a rupture of diplomatic relations between St. Petersburg and London, and a campaign in the far East. It would suit Germany and Austria to see Russia engaged in the East before serious complications, ending in war, arise in the Balkans, because the whole

concentrated force of the vast Northern Empire could not then be available in that direction.

Another possibility is a territorial extension of Austria down to the Ægæan Sea, and the union of the Balkan states with Austria by stronger ties than those of a mere confederacy. In this case a cession of the German speaking provinces to Germany, and a transfer of the seat of the new Empire from Vienna to Pesth lie within the reach of not improbable conjectures. England's consent could be bought by allowing her to take Egypt, a price that no doubt would be willingly paid and gladly accepted. France and Italy could not raise any protest *except* they were supported by Russia. And in this probability, namely, that they will be supported by Russia, exists the key to the whole situation.

England's interests run, *ipsissima natura*, so much counter to those of the Empire of the North that her position in the coming conflict cannot be considered doubtful at all. Germany and Austria, as we have seen, may endeavor to resort to every subterfuge of diplomacy to gain time within which to reinforce their own strength and stave off an approach of France and Russia; to gain that object they will be ready to make sacrifices. But we think that ultimately an alliance between France and Russia must take place.

It does not require any sagacity to perceive the immense advantages accruing to both powers from it. The German army would be divided so that neither France nor Russia would have to confront the whole strength of the splendidly trained soldiers of Emperor William. Russia, whose fleet is locked up in the Baltic and the Black Sea, would gain the assistance of the powerful French navy, which is now in numbers as well as in armament a match even for England. France, on the other hand, with Russia as an ally, can then attempt to realize her fond dream of revenge, for since Sedan the one preëminent thought of that nation has been to wipe out the disasters of 1870-71; and while she justly hesitates to measure strength with Germany single-handed, the popular feeling will drive her to break a lance with Germany the moment Germany is engaged otherwise. That point can hardly offer any doubt. If France can, she will retrieve her misfortunes, as soon as she may, at least, hope for success.

Italy, the least interested of all the great powers, may avail herself of the opportunity of Austria's engagements in the Balkans against Russia to obtain the long-coveted Italian-speaking provinces of the House of Hapsburg and the port of Trieste. Turkey, finally, remains an uncertain factor. Doomed under all circumstances to quit Europe and lose her dominions on this side of the Bosphorus, it is but natural that the Porte will try to throw her

weight on that side to which victory may seem to lean. Yet her attitude remains perhaps the most uncertain factor.

If we consider, in conclusion, the size of the armies each of the powers mentioned has at command, an approximate idea of the immensity of the impending conflict may be formed. Russia, the Colossus of the North, possesses on a war footing over 2,500,000 well trained, well equipped soldiers, with a possibility of raising that number to nearly ten millions. France can mobilize two millions within thirty days, Germany likewise two millions, Austro-Hungary a million and a half, with a possibility of more than duplicating that number; Italy has an army of one million at her disposal. To this mass of soldiery must be added England's forces and those of the Turkish Empire and of all the Balkan states, swelling the total aggregate to ten million men. War would be waged on the Rhine and on the Bosphorus, in Italy and in Poland and in the East. If we bear in mind that these modern armies have been brought to the highest perfection of discipline and training, that they are equipped with armaments which render the prospective loss of life frightful to contemplate; if we remember the enormous sums required to support this vast armed camp and the terrible drain upon the revenues these sums entail; if we also reflect upon the unavoidable amount of misery, desolation, wretchedness and poverty following in the wake, we may, then, begin to understand why those who stand at the helm of the governments pause and hesitate to assume the awful responsibility of uttering the word that will set in motion this vast machinery of destruction.

Whether it be possible even by the most powerful combination to check permanently the onward march of a nation which is still in the ascendancy, only the future can answer. To foretell the probable result would be to indulge in idle speculations of a most uncertain character. It is certain, however, that ere long the struggle will take place, and that it will be a struggle of unparalleled magnitude ending in a redistribution of power and territory. And it is also certain that, when Providence decrees, the columns will advance.

WILL THE TORIES GIVE IRELAND HOME RULE?

WHEN the British Parliament met on the 18th of August, everything looked extremely favorable for the advocates of the Legislative Union. The Tories overflowed their benches, the Liberal Unionists were in a state of violent self-satisfaction, and Liberals could not conceal the mortification, depression, and demoralization which the unexpected result of the elections had produced amongst them. Some of the events which immediately followed the opening day were highly calculated to increase the self-satisfaction of the enemies of Ireland. People had hoped against hope that the Liberal Unionists would return to their allegiance to the Liberal leader and to the Liberal party, and that the sight of a Tory ministry in power would be enough to shake their resolution and to drive them back to the arms of Mr. Gladstone. The Liberal Unionists took a very early opportunity of at once crushing these hopes. Lord Hartington made one of the most vigorous speeches of his life in denunciation of the idea that he had changed his mind, and gave it clearly to be understood that he and the Government were in opinion as one. Mr. Chamberlain went even further. In a speech full of vehemence and vigor he committed himself to the statement that he would never give a vote to put out the present Government if its successor were to be what he called a "separatist ministry." There were some obstinate optimists who were foolish enough to be very much disappointed by these speeches.

Even Mr. Gladstone himself was rather cast down. His nature is essentially sanguine. He felt the profound conviction that reason and justice were both on his side, and he would not entertain the idea that those who had served formerly with him would long resist the cause of good sense and of political comradeship. For this reason he had discouraged attacks upon his opponents by his own party. Everybody execrated the ill taste of Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Hartington in pushing themselves on to the front opposition bench in order to thwart the Liberal leader and to support the Tory ministry. Representations were made to Mr. Gladstone that he should take some steps to prevent this outrage upon decency; but he refused to listen to this advice, and Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain were allowed to take their seats beside him and Mr. John Morley. At last, however, he recognized the truth and has made up his mind that by the end of this struggle Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain will be against him.

Indeed, many of the men who were in immediate political contact with him make no attempt at concealing the fact that they are irreconcilable. They state most clearly that they intend to support the Tories as long as Mr. Gladstone remains the leader of the Liberal party. His death or his resignation is the one possible termination they admit to the alliance of the Tory party; and the question now is whether they will be able to crush Mr. Gladstone or Mr. Gladstone will be able to crush them.

The session, however, soon developed a very different state of affairs. The Ministry had adopted a method of preventing any of those discussions of their plans or policy in which lie gravest danger. The language put into the mouth of the Queen was brief to boldness. The solitary reference to Ireland was a statement that the election had confirmed the adverse verdict against Home Rule, and it was almost impossible to find within the limits of this brief document any point that could be controverted or even seriously debated. Mr. Gladstone felt this so much that his first speech in reply to the Address from the Throne was terse and almost free from anything like disputatious matter. This was the result not merely of boldness of the Queen's Speech, but also of his own view of the situation.

Public opinion, too, was dead against the revival for the moment of the Home Rule controversy. The inevitable ebb of fatigue and apathy had succeeded to the full tide of enthusiasm in which the election had been fought. Then Mr. Gladstone had done many things during the election which enabled his enemies to scoff. He had gone on the stump through the country, had delivered a series of remarkable speeches which had led to enormous demonstrations, and in this way had been forced to keep himself largely before the public. His eagerness for the success of his policy had also induced him to take every possible step to assure the victory, and he had written innumerable letters and telegrams in favor of Home Rule candidates. These things had spread the idea that Mr. Gladstone was losing his temper; and the loss of temper is one of the unforgivable sins with the political public of England. His watchful and venomous enemies were preparing, under these circumstances, for an explosion of wild and childish wrath against all his opponents when Parliament met. It was for this reason that the late Premier felt the necessity of adopting an attitude of tranquillity and reserve, and that he abstained from as vigorous criticism of the Queen's Speech as might have been expected. But the great reason for the attitude of Mr. Gladstone was the character of the Queen's Speech itself. Saying nothing, it saved itself from criticism. To attack it was to fight with a phantom, and accordingly Mr. Gladstone contented himself with a brief recapitulation of his

opinions on the Irish question, and an expression of his unalterable resolve to work for Irish self-government.

The speech of Lord Randolph Churchill made a revolutionary change in this situation. The new Tory leader delivered an address which ranged far beyond the narrow limits of the Queen's Speech, and elaborated a large and ambitious programme for the future. The Ministry did not intend to be as idle and as uncommitted as their Queen's Speech. They had a paragraph, partly consisting of vague promises as to the future, and also definite statements as to the immediate present. The future would be provided for by a series of commissions, who would inquire into nearly every subject of Irish complaint. A commission would investigate the question of judicial rents; another commission would inquire as to the industrial probabilities of Ireland, and a general officer would be sent to Kerry for the purpose of restoring order in that district. But while a commission was thus to inquire into the judicial rents, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was careful to explain that these judicial rents would not be interfered with. "If there are any persons in this House," he said, "who are of opinion that there will be, by the Government, any interference with, or suspension of, legislation, or the neglect of executive action, of the right of landlords to recover their land, in the event of the non-payment of rent, they fall into great and serious error." And again: "A serious mistake," he said, "will be made by any who think that the Government contemplate any further dealing with the land question in Ireland, in the direction of any revision of the rent, by the interposition of the State. This is altogether apart from the policy of the present Government." And then he went on to utter a strong denunciation of the system of dual ownership, established by the Land Act of 1881, and to declare that the policy of the Government would be to transform dual into single ownerships; in other words, to establish a peasant proprietary. Before turning from this part of the policy of the Government, we may make a passing observation, that the criticisms of Lord Randolph Churchill upon the dual ownership under the Land Act of 1881 might have been stolen from hundreds of speeches of the same character, delivered by the Irish members, and by the speakers of the Land League, in 1881.

Here was an annunciation of a policy with a vengeance. That night little was said by the English members, who were not yet in full possession of their spirits and wills. Besides, the Liberal Party were entirely ignorant of the very important speech that was being delivered elsewhere while they were listening to the address of Lord Randolph Churchill. In the House of Lords, at that very moment, the other Tory leader had been describing the same

policy, but in doing so had fallen into phrases more pointed and less adroit than those of his subordinate in the Lower Chamber. On the question of judicial rents, he took up the same attitude: "We do not," he said, "contemplate any revision of the judicial rents." But this was followed by another, and a more remarkable, statement. The dual ownership was denounced in pretty much the same terms as those employed by Lord Randolph Churchill, and then an important guide was given to the principles which would regulate any land-purchase scheme by the Tory Government. Lord Salisbury was still talking about the judicial rents, and while generally defending them as righteous, admitted that there might be some cases of hardship; but he went on: "But if it should come out that the courts have made blunders, and that there is that impossibility in any case of paying rent, I think it is not the landlords who should bear the loss. I think this would be one of the cases for the application of the principle of purchase by the State, and that the State, and not the landlords, must suffer for the errors that have been made." The Liberal Party immediately saw the vast importance of this full and disastrous revelation of Tory policy. When the story of the general election of 1886 comes to be told, it will be found that the hostility to the Land Purchase Bill of Mr. Gladstone did more to create the majority against him than hostility to his Home Rule proposals. Throughout the elections, too, he had been assailed upon this part of his policy with the most virulent and most unscrupulous attack. The truth had been suppressed; lies had been suggested; misrepresentation reached Alpine heights. In nearly every constituency the Tories or the Liberal Unionists displayed cartoons, in which the honest British workman was exhibited as standing appalled before the statement of Mr. Gladstone, that he had to pay one hundred or one hundred and fifty millions sterling, and he sometimes soared higher, and the sum was fixed at 250 millions, and that all this was to be done to save Irish landlords, who have become an object of almost as profound hate to the English artisan as to the Irish farmer. Mr. John Bright and Mr. Chamberlain, especially, distinguished themselves by the vehemence with which they had denounced this part of the Gladstone scheme. Mr. Bright did not inform his hearers that in the Land Act of 1870 there are clauses which, to this day, are known as the "Bright Clauses"; that these clauses are for the purpose of facilitating the creation of a peasant proprietary, and that they are the very inception of the system of land purchase, through the agency of the State or the legislature of the British Empire. Mr. Chamberlain was even more uncandid; he had submitted to the Cabinet, while yet still one of its members, a scheme of land purchase devised by his own hand. In this

scheme, we understand, it was proposed that the sum of forty millions should be spent in buying out the Irish landlords, and a financier so experienced and so trustworthy as Mr. Gladstone declared that there was every probability of most of the forty millions being hopelessly lost through the faults of the scheme. The point, then, between Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Gladstone was not really whether there should be a land scheme at all, but whether land purchase should be to the extent of forty or fifty millions of money, and whether it should be passed concurrently with the establishment of a Central Council, or of a series of Provincial Councils. But Mr. Chamberlain could not be either cajoled or bullied, throughout the election, into saying one word with regard to his own purchase scheme, and the general masses were left to infer that he was opposed to any and every form of pledging the credit of the English Exchequer for the purchasing out of the Irish landlords.

Attempts had been made by the Home Rule Liberals, in all constituencies, to meet these misrepresentations. It had been pointed out that land purchase had passed from the region of controversy, and had, in previous sessions of Parliament, been accepted with equal ardor by Tories, Liberals, and Radicals. Moreover, the electors were asked to decide whether it was more likely that the land purchase scheme, so favorable to the landlords, and to paralyze the British Exchequer, would be passed by Mr. Gladstone or by the Marquis of Salisbury,—by a financier of genius, who represented the anti-landlord party, or by an amateur whose interests, prejudices, and passions were all in favor of the most extreme demands and privileges of landlordism.

The fierce joy will be understood with which the Liberals received the speech of Lord Randolph Churchill, and still more after the speech of the Marquis of Salisbury. Here was a vindication of Mr. Gladstone, but at a period much earlier than the most sanguine could have anticipated. Here was a revelation of the worst prophecies as to the Tory policy on land purchase. For some days after the hand of the Government had been thus revealed, the slender thread by which the coalition of Mr. Gladstone's enemies was kept together was strained almost to snapping. It was held that the Liberal, and still more the Radical, Unionists were placed in a perfectly impossible position, that they were presented the unhappy alternative of denouncing the plans of the Government or accepting plans they had hitherto denounced. The position of Mr. Chamberlain was especially infelicitous, inasmuch as it was to his harangues on land purchase, as has been already seen, that Mr. Gladstone owed a great part of his defeat. However, negotiations took place in the meantime, the net result of which was, that Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain were to throw the plans of the Government overboard,

and that the Government were to give a consent of silence to the projected annihilation of their own policy. In the course of the debate that followed, Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain both spoke with great dexterity, especially the latter; but their dexterity did not succeed in hiding the untenableness of their position; they also joined in an important statement that threw a great light upon the struggle in the country, and that largely strengthened Mr. Gladstone's hand in the future. They both avowed themselves strong supporters of a policy of land purchase. Lord Hartington, taking this attitude, was perfectly consistent, for with the straightforwardness which has distinguished him throughout this crisis, he always did express his sympathy with the policy of land purchase; but with Mr. Chamberlain the case was quite different, for, as has been previously remarked, throughout the whole electoral contest he never, by the least whisper or hint, gave it to be understood that land purchase would in him ever find a supporter.

The country, then, for the first time saw the real issue between Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Chamberlain, and it served to confirm the impression of the sagacious statesmanship of Mr. Gladstone and of the passionate unscrupulousness of Mr. Chamberlain. Here was much gained on the General Election, but a still more important announcement followed immediately after. In the absence of Mr. Gladstone, the leadership of the Liberal Party fell to Sir Wm. Harcourt. It was his duty to reply to the attack upon his former colleagues which Mr. Chamberlain had made. He took care to bring into clear relief the imprudent utterance to which, in the ferocity of his ill temper, Mr. Chamberlain had committed himself. If it were true that Mr. Chamberlain was, as he had said, determined to give no vote against the present Government as long as Mr. Gladstone and a Home-Rule Administration were to follow, then, said Sir William Harcourt, there was no necessity whatever for Mr. Chamberlain giving the slightest reasons in favor of the Government or of their policy, and whatsoever they proposed found in him a fervid and constant supporter. This was a dexterous appeal. In England, as in all other countries ruled by party government, there is a good deal of unreasonable as well as of reasonable party spirit. It is as hard to convince a Liberal that he is right in voting for a Tory Government, as to convince an American Democrat that the circumstances justify him voting for a Republican Administration, or *vice versa*. Undoubtedly the Liberalism of England received a rude shock when the Radical leader announced his determination to maintain as long as he could a Tory Government in power rather than permit the accession of Mr. Gladstone once more to office. But Sir William Harcourt had a much more important announcement to make directly afterwards. Mr.

Chamberlain had endeavored to fasten upon the late Government forever the policy of the recent elections; that policy was that any scheme of Home Rule should be accompanied by a Land Purchase Bill. The preceding pages will have clearly shown that this was an almost impossible policy, as some of Mr. Gladstone's strong supporters on the Home Rule side of his policy had been so opposed to the land purchase side of his scheme as to have pledged themselves in the strongest language to their constituents against it. To have pinned Mr. Gladstone then to a joint policy of Home Rule and land purchase, would have been to place him in a position in which he would have been compelled to disintegrate his party, and to lose for Home Rule the support of his most faithful and earnest followers through their hatred of land purchase, and then Mr. Gladstone and Sir Wm. Harcourt by a masterly stroke of strategy rescued themselves from this untenable position. Mr. Gladstone in his pamphlet pronounced himself still of the opinion that land purchase would be desirable, but he expressly at the same time declared that the two things which he formerly regarded as indissoluble could now be treated separately, and that Home Rule and land purchase were not bound to accompany one the other.

The House of Commons had not been made acquainted with the contents of Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet at the time when Sir Wm. Harcourt was making his reply to Mr. Chamberlain. The announcement, then, that the Liberal leader in the future regarded the two questions as separable came with a startling suddenness like a thunderclap upon the assembly. Sir Wm. Harcourt first recapitulated the same views and successful arguments with which Mr. Chamberlain had opposed the Land Purchase Bill of Mr. Gladstone. "Yes, sir," said Sir William Harcourt in continuation, "I admit the force of these arguments, and I tell my right honorable friend, in making those arguments popular he has destroyed in advance the Land Bill, not only of the last Government, but the Bill of the Government that has come after them. Well, then," he said, "we are bound to treat the question of Home Rule and the question of land purchase as inseparable. He has tried to pin us to that, but he will not succeed in doing so. He cannot have his irrevocable and irreversible verdict, and yet treat it as if it had never taken place, and I say, in answer to my Right Honorable friend, and I am speaking the opinion of the member for Midlothian, that the two questions are not inseparable." These words had scarcely dropped from the mouth of Sir Wm. Harcourt when there ensued a scene—brief, but as remarkable as any beheld recently in the House of Commons. From the Radical and the Irish benches there burst forth a tempest of cheers—cheers that told of relief

after long pent-up anxiety. For the Radical members and the Irish members were agreed in the opinion that land purchase and Home Rule should be made separate—the Radicals because they had pledged themselves against it, and found land purchase a proposal absolutely irreconcilable with the views or prejudices of the working classes; the Irish because they had already seen the land purchase scheme destroy the prospects of Home Rule, and they were rejoiced to find that once more Irish liberty was not to be sacrificed to Irish landlords. And how was it with the Tories? Their shouts of disgust and despair almost reached to unmanly tooting. They saw at once the masterly retreat which the Liberal leaders had made, and they felt that one of their great vantage-grounds had been taken away from them forever. But more significant than the shouts either of the Liberals or of the Tories was the silence of the Irish landlords. Col. Saunderson, one of the chief spokesmen of the Orange party, grew passively pale, and amid all the wild tumult around him never opened his lips; and to add to his discomfort there arose from several throats on the Irish benches shouts such as, "How do the landlords like that?" "Landlordism is doomed," and other passionate phrases that marked the fateful importance of the decree that had thus been uttered from the lips of Sir Wm. Harcourt against the class which has wrought most of Ireland's ills.

The next day Radicals met each other with an unaccustomed grin in their eyes; they felt that the future had all at once been made clear and sunny instead of dark and sinister; and, for the first time since the general election, began to believe in the near and certain victory of their cause.

Sir Wm. Harcourt's speech took place on the night of August 27th, 1886, only nine days after the effective work of the session had begun; and already the situation had been transformed and the Government greatly damaged. This was in complete accordance with the views of those who declared that the coalition of the heterogeneous elements of hostility to Mr. Gladstone could not endure the strain of Parliamentary discussion. It was not long before another event arose which subjected the temporary alliance to a further rude shock. After the close of the debate on the Address Lord Randolph Churchill had to move a motion asking for the whole time of the House. Mr. Parnell had previously laid before Parliament a statement of things in Ireland, the desperate straits to which the farmers were reduced by the revolutionary fall of prices, and pointed out the necessity of some new legislation for meeting this crisis. These declarations both the Government and Mr. Chamberlain had set at nought, and the Irish farmers were thus left to face the winter with the prospect of making their choice

between violent resistance to the payment of impossible rents or tame submission to wholesale eviction. On Lord Randolph Churchill's motion for taking up the whole of the time of the House a last attempt was made to save Ireland from this calamity, and Mr. John Dillon proposed an amendment calling upon the Government to introduce immediate legislation to meet the emergency in Ireland. In the course of the debate upon this amendment Mr. Parnell made a dexterous suggestion; he declared his complete readiness to allow the Government all the time of the House if they would consent to give him a day for the discussion of a definite measure for dealing with the Irish case. He indicated the lines which this measure would take, following up similar suggestions he had made on his own amendment a few days previously. The courts would have power to revise the rents with the view to the fall in agricultural prices; to stay proceedings where they thought a case had been made out for an abatement on payment of a certain instalment of the rent; and he proposed also a clause admitting the leaseholder to the benefits of the Land Act of 1881. To the surprise of everybody, and, which afterwards turned out, to the satisfaction of many of his own party, Lord Randolph Churchill swallowed the bait, and at once consented to give Mr. Parnell a day for the discussion of such a Bill. Ever since that promise the Bill of the Irish leader has engrossed public attention to the exclusion of almost every other topic. Again the Liberal and Radical Unionists were placed in a position of inextricable complexity and delicacy. In the course of his speeches against the Home Rule and land proposals of Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Chamberlain had committed himself to a remarkably strong statement as to the very question which Mr. Parnell's Bill now raised. He acknowledged that the price of agricultural produce in Ireland had fallen to between 20 and 30 per cent.; he declared that such a fall in prices must entail great suffering on the tenants, and proposed as a settlement the suspension of all evictions for six months—the landlords being recouped the loss of their rents out of the Imperial Exchequer. There was no mode of reasoning by which he could escape logically from this statement; and up to the time at which we write—which is before the discussion of Mr. Parnell's Bill—the general impression was that he would save himself by abstaining from attendance at the debate on the division. It will at once be seen that this weak and cowardly method of escape must entail its evil consequences, and must even increase the rapidly growing disgust for the attitude of the Radicals who support the Tory administration through thick and through thin, and through evil as zealously as through good.

Another remarkable fact, in connection with the effect of the

meeting of Parliament on the coalition against Mr. Gladstone, is the smallness of the number which the Liberal Unionists have been able to bring into the division lobby. In the division on Mr. Parnell's amendment, the Irish Party had 81 votes out of a possible 81—four votes being lost through Mr. McCarthy's inability to take his seat until the Derry Election has been settled, the absence of Mr. Redmond and Mr. Deasy in America, and through the double return of Mr. Sexton. The Liberal Unionists have a nominal strength, on the other hand, of 73 votes, and the largest total they have ever been able to record in a division has been something between forty and fifty. The real truth, with regard to this body, is that they are neither followers of Lord Hartington nor of Mr. Chamberlain. Each of these two leaders has a certain small number of personal adherents, but the majority of the body are independent atoms who have, in some way or other, drifted into their position, who feel very uncomfortable in it, and who are eager for an opportunity of once more being taken back into the ranks of their own party. On the other hand, there is a certain number, unquestionably, who are Liberals merely in name, and who would be extremely delighted with an opportunity of going over to the Tory party. As time goes on, they will probably make their choice in favor of the Conservatives, and will definitely join their fortunes with those of the opposite party. These men, of course, are bolters. They will not give a vote that can possibly subject their seats to the risk of a general election, and they will remain, in all probability, as ardent and as trustworthy supporters of the Government as any of their own followers. In Irish politics we have had but too much experience of this class of politician. During the years when the Liberal administration was coercing Ireland, they found no more strenuous supporters than some of the Irish members who had been returned as Nationalist members. And in the strenuous and unwavering support of such men the Liberals enjoyed an impregnable bulwark against the attacks of the Irish party. It is, therefore, not very easy to say what will be the future action of the heterogeneous body called Liberal Unionists. We think they will act differently according to their respective characters and purposes. Those who are drifting towards Conservatism will, probably, remain supporters of the Administration, whereas those who have the least degree of Liberalism left, and are anxious to remain with the Liberal party, will not be able to bear, for many sessions, the strain of the present alliance. The first pages of this article were intended to show how severe is the strain which Parliamentary discussions place upon the loyalty to the Tory administration of such men, and all this change in the relative position of parties has taken place on the very morrow of

the great Conservative victory and after but a few weeks of Parliamentary life.

It is at once the strength of the Irish and the weakness of the English position in an empire so widespread, with so many points of contact, with such an infinite multiplicity of interests, and with such an overwhelming mass of unsolved problems, that there must constantly arise questions of difficulty and dispute. It is all very well for Mr. Chamberlain to agree with Lord Randolph Churchill upon the question of Ireland; but that does not involve an agreement of opinion on India, on Australia, and, above all, on foreign policy. Events in Eastern Europe are approaching a crisis which threatens to raise issues of the most complicated and most delicate kind. It is possible that, on any day, the Government may take a decision which will make their further support impossible by any member of Parliament who ever hopes again to become one of the Liberal Party.

Then, there is always the great chapter of accidents, which plays in the parliamentary institutions of England a greater part than in the history of any other nation. Mr. Gladstone entered office in 1880 with a majority of 100 over his Conservative opponents, and in March of 1881 that majority had fallen down to 39; a few years later it had fallen to 28, and then it came down to 14, and, finally, the majority was transformed into a minority. All this was accomplished by the Irish party, as was shown on nearly half its strength by the apostasy of the nominal Home Rulers, and which never reached a higher total than 45 members. It is, therefore, easy to see that the inevitable hour will come to the Tory government as to all other English ministries, and that some question will arise which will make their further existence impossible.

We had written thus far when Lord Randolph Churchill made an announcement which marks the beginning of the end. He was being hard pressed on Wednesday, September 15th, on the Irish estimates, and especially on the estimates for the Local Government. The Chief Secretary had indulged in some pettish complaint as to the length of time the Irish members had consumed in debate on this most important subject, and Lord Randolph Churchill got up and made use of the following remarkable words. In replying to an Irish member, Lord Randolph Churchill said:

"The honorable gentleman was doing the Government an injustice in supposing that they had not given their anxious attention to those grievances. With regard to what had been said on a former vote, he thought that the functions of the Board of Works and the Local Government Board called for the most careful consideration from the Government, with a view to their development, so far as might be, in accordance with Irish ideas and desires. It

was the decided intention of the Government to make proposals to Parliament at the earliest opportunity, which he hoped might be next session. The object of those proposals would be to place the control of all those questions in the hands of the Irish people. Of course, that would be done within the limits fixed by the verdict of the constituencies at the last election; limits which the Government had neither the wish nor the power to overstep. The Government desired to act honestly, and at the same time practically, in this matter, and he appealed to that sense of fairness which he believed was never altogether absent from the minds of even the most violent and reckless opponents of the Government, to give the Government time to consider this large and intricate question; and if they failed in their duty by not bringing forward proposals, or making proposals which were insufficient or bad, then, undoubtedly, the Government would not be able to raise strong objections against honorable members taking the course they at present followed."

The importance of these words has been at once seen by the English press, and has been made the subject of universal comment. They indicate a considerable advance in the intentions of the Government. Just before the opening of Parliament, Lord Randolph Churchill defined to an intimate friend his policy simply as that of saying nothing and doing nothing. It is perfectly clear that this policy has already been found impracticable; it was, of course, clearly within the bounds of reason in the truncated session which was called together merely for the purpose of passing the accounts of the year. But it will be very different when Parliament meets next year for the discussion of regular business and has several months to run. If Lord Randolph Churchill should then endeavor to carry out the policy of doing nothing and saying nothing, he would place the Liberal Unionists in an equally false position, to which they could not reconcile themselves. They did not, during the general election, contend, any one of them, nor, indeed, did the Conservatives themselves contend, that the state of and relations between England and Ireland, which at present exist, were altogether satisfactory, and even the most reactionary among the Liberal Unionists declared for a large, if not a revolutionary change in the local government of Ireland.

The maintenance of the present state of affairs is perfectly impossible, in view of this declaration; and the question now is, not whether Ireland should have local self-government, but how much and how little she may have. Two theories are held, with regard to the manner in which Lord Randolph Churchill will try to solve this problem. The more probable theory is, that he will act in accordance with the views of the majority of his party, and those

views certainly are in direct antagonism to a scheme of so large and wide-reaching a scope as that of Mr. Gladstone. Two considerations are brought forward in favor of this forecast. First, that Lord Hartington is just as strongly opposed as any of the Tories themselves to a measure which would make the Irish administration and the Irish assembly independent of the Imperial Parliament. Secondly, It is held that the Irish question serves a useful purpose for the Conservative party, in being the bulwark against the advance of democracy. As long as this question is kept open, English reform becomes either impossible or must make its advances with a leaden step. The removal of the Irish grievance, on the other hand, would concentrate the attention of Englishmen on their own grievances and abuses, and, in that way, would give an enormous acceleration to the work of reform.

The other forecast is, that Lord Randolph Churchill will seize the opportunity of giving to Ireland a settlement at least as large as, and perhaps more enduring than, that which was proffered by Mr. Gladstone. There are some plausible arguments in favor of this anticipation. Lord Randolph Churchill is at once a man of keen ambition and clear vision. The follies and eccentricities of the anti-Ministerial days were the results sometimes of cold calculation, and at other times of an impulsive and irritable temper. He grasped, at an early date, the fact that the very first essential of success in a country recently democratized in its institutions, was to concentrate public attention. He deliberately came to the conclusion that wildness of attack and extravagance of demeanor were the most direct means of concentrating this attention, and the extraordinary and almost unprecedented success which has attended his efforts makes out a strong case in favor of the accuracy of his estimates. He is quite a different man from Mr. Chamberlain, who unites to great debating power an extremely shallow mind and an almost appalling ignorance of public questions generally. Mr. Chamberlain has no more comprehension of the Irish question than of the politics of Timbuctoo; and his ignorance is invincible, because it is that of self-conceit and of intellectual hollowness. Lord Randolph Churchill is entirely the antithesis of this. His father was Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland at the serious turning-point in Irish history, and Lord Randolph Churchill, at the time acting as one of his secretaries, was able to study the question with singular advantage. Then, he is a man who can see clearly into any question which he takes the trouble of mastering. His mind is cold, clear, without scruple and without passion. It would not cause him one twinge of conscience or of heart if, to-morrow, Ireland were to receive a legislature as independent as any that the most advanced Irish Nationalist ever

dreamed of. It is, therefore, held by many that Lord Randolph Churchill knows, as well as Mr. Gladstone himself, that Home Rule is inevitable, and that the only Home Rule which would have the least chance of settling the Irish question would be one that creates a real Irish Executive and a real Irish Parliament. His ambition and his own opinions might well lead him to desire the final settlement of the Irish question. It would make his name immortal in the annals of the two countries. For the Minister who closes the Irish question will close a struggle more prolonged, more fierce, and more complex than, perhaps, any ever recorded in human annals. Lord Randolph Churchill may, perhaps, not have the temperament that is specially anxious as to posthumous fame; but the settlement of the Irish question would bring immediate as well as remote profit to a Minister. It would give a prestige for political sagacity, parliamentary adroitness, and statesmanlike success which would make him an almost irresistible leader in future political conflicts. Lord Randolph Churchill, as the successful Minister who reconciled Ireland, would establish a claim during the remainder of his life, not only to the leadership of his own party, but also to the first Ministry in the Empire. Nor are there wanting personal reasons which might induce Lord Randolph Churchill to take up this attitude. The present position of the Ministry, of which he is the chief figure, is, in many respects, difficult and humiliating. They cannot take any steps without the previous consent of the Liberal Unionists. The Liberal Unionists are their dictators and masters. Even policies which they have decided upon, they have to modify or explain away when the *mot d'ordre* comes from their exacting patrons. Instances have already been given of the manner in which they have had to bow to this tyranny during the present session, short as it has been. The language of Lord Salisbury and of Lord Randolph Churchill on the future of land purchase produced, as has been seen, a scare among the Liberal Unionists, and it was only permission to explain away this language, or to treat it as if it had never been spoken, that led the Tory Government and the Liberal Unionists to act in concert together. Such a despotism is peculiarly obnoxious to a man of Lord Randolph Churchill's temperament. His whole character is one of impassioned and arrogant masterfulness; and to be checked and dictated to at every step by men outside his own party must be, therefore, extremely galling.

And of all the Members, the one whom Lord Randolph Churchill probably finds intolerable above all others is the Marquis of Hartington. With all its enmities, the House of Commons has no two personal hostilities more profound and intense than those between the present Tory and the present Whig leader. During

his years of parliamentary life, the Marquis of Hartington has been able to preserve an exterior of equable, not to say sluggish, tranquillity. The one or two occasions on which he has been found to lose his temper have been when he was called upon to encounter a question or a speech by Lord Randolph Churchill. Besides, Lord Randolph is a Tory democrat, and, like the inventor of that political genus, the late Lord Beaconsfield, he regards with especial loathing the Whig. This Tory and demagogic spirit finds far more kinship in the Radicalism and in the personal characteristics of Mr. Chamberlain, and it is no secret that between the two there is a strong personal attraction. A large scheme of Home Rule would have the effect of "dishing" the Marquis of Hartington, and there could be no more attractive temptation to Lord Randolph Churchill in favor of any policy. Furthermore, Lord Randolph Churchill, by a large scheme of Home Rule, would "dish" Mr. Gladstone. If any such scheme should receive the support of the late Prime Minister, of the Irish Nationalists, and of all or nearly all the Tories, it would pass through the House of Lords without any friction of consequence. To Mr. Gladstone Lord Randolph Churchill has probably no personal enmity; but then he may well be dazzled by the prospect of succeeding where the greatest parliamentarian of his time failed; and the prospect of doing that which Mr. Gladstone could not do is one that may well take his breath away.

However, whichever of these forecasts may turn out correct, the future of Home Rule seems equally assured. We have always regarded Home Rule as, so to speak, an inclined plane; the first step taken leads inevitably down to the end of the plane, with a real parliament and a real executive. There is no standing ground between the present state of things and that end and goal. For instance, one of the solutions of the Liberal Unionists was an Irish Parliament with limited powers, and the retention of the Irish members in their full strength, and for all purposes, at Westminster. We need not waste very much space in pointing out that such a solution of the question would be no solution at all. The Irish members have already shown their power at Westminster. They have turned out Ministries, upset all calculations, set all standing orders topsy-turvy, and made mince-meat of the most precious of Ministerial programmes. One would think this lesson would not have been lost upon the British Parliament, and that they would have seen that the presence of the Irish members in Westminster would have meant the final triumph of any policy on which the Irish members were united. We need scarcely say, if the legislature in Ireland were subordinate and sham, the thing the Irish party would proceed to do would be to agitate for an extension of the

powers of such a legislature. At one time they would vote with the Tories, at another with the Liberals, at all times in a body. The resistance to Home Rule would have, meantime, been almost completely emasculated by the concessions already made. The legislature in Dublin would stand behind the representatives in Westminster as the authentic mouthpiece of the wishes of the Irish people, and in this way the concession of larger powers would be a question of time, and of a very short time.

In the interval the Imperial Parliament and Imperial ministries would be once more turned topsy-turvy; the Irish question would have shadowed and absorbed all other interests, and there would be a further period of Irish discontent and English unrest. We may exaggerate the effect of good sense and of inevitable inferences upon the House of Commons, but we can scarcely think that reasoning like this would fail to have its effect, and that the House of Commons would consent to a scheme fraught with such plain and undeniable evils. If, then, Lord Randolph Churchill begins dealing with the question of Home Rule, it appears to us almost impossible that he can avoid reaching practically the same goal as was reached by Mr. Gladstone, and that thus by a more circuitous route, and by Tory instead of by Liberal hands, the Irish people may attain fulfilment of their aspirations.

In any case, the introduction of a measure of local government by the Tory Ministry must produce a very important and very beneficent change in the future of the Irish question. Home Rule will at once be removed from the region of exasperation and senseless controversy. Parties will differ, and differ strongly, as to the character of the proposals of the Government. The Irish members will in all probability be called upon to protest strongly against the schemes of Lord Randolph Churchill as neither rational, acceptable, nor durable, but all the same the question will have passed from the region of rhetoric and inflammatory Jingoism to that of sober argument. It is, very obviously, a great advance on the state of the controversy at the General Election, when even Tories are discussing whether this much Home Rule or that is desirable; and when they are only concerned as to the limits within which self-government is desirable and beyond which it would be dangerous.

Then, in the divisions which must take place upon such a Bill, it will be quite impossible for the Liberal Unionists to act together. Already many of them have "shed" a good many of their original objections to the scheme, and would now be satisfied with a control on the part of the Imperial Parliament which would be of a most shadowy character. It is scarcely probable that the whole body would be able to go consistently together throughout the long struggle on details; and when the differences between Mr. Gladstone

and Lord Randolph Churchill come down to a mere matter of detail, the Liberal Unionists who still hope to remain in the Liberal ranks will gravitate towards their old side and their old leader. It is thus possible, even if the scheme of the Government should start out as a small one, that it may be changed in committee and on the chessboard of rival factions until it has attained a width and a largeness that will make it different but in name from the proposals of Mr. Gladstone.

Meantime we have made a very important assumption. We have assumed that the Government was certain to bring in, at the beginning of the next session, a Local Government Bill. One of the reasons on which we have based this large proposition is the short speech of Lord Randolph Churchill in the House of Commons on Wednesday, the 15th of September. It is possible that these words, vague as they are, may be a small foundation for such a large edifice, and unquestionably they are words which Lord Randolph Churchill would have no very great difficulty in explaining away if self-interest so demanded; and we have no doubt that if he could he would be only too glad to adhere to his original programme, saying nothing and doing nothing, and avoiding the thorny path of Irish reform. We have no doubt, however, that there is one thing which would possibly prevent the introduction of a Local Government Bill, and that is such a state of affairs in Ireland as would compel the Government to introduce coercion. What their views of coercion are, it is impossible to say; probably they do not know themselves.

There are some who think that it is the deliberate purpose of Lord Randolph Churchill to create such a state of things in Ireland as will make coercion unavoidable, in the hope that coercion may afford an escape from concession. Coercion certainly might, for the moment, have such results. Coercion is an appeal to the brutal passions of the dominant race, and, as such, may well be calculated to excite one of those brief but fierce gusts of unreasoning passion to which the English people are subject. On the other hand, to coercive proposals the Irish members would be bound to offer opposition, which would still further inflame English opinion, and which might for a time estrange even the Liberal support; but coercion has its dangers for the Government as well as its temptations. There is no doubt that it would be violently opposed by Mr. Gladstone and the Liberal party generally, and that they would exhaust nearly all the forms of the House in resisting it. We think the English people are rather sick of coercion; it is a remedy that is thoroughly discredited and odious. Besides, the strong sympathy which America and the civilized world generally has exhibited for the cause of Ireland, must have its effect

upon the English mind; for the coercion of Ireland would excite the condemnation of every country outside England, and this would have the effect of paralyzing the English power.

At the same time, the state of affairs in Ireland is full of perils. It would be a relief to the Irish leaders, as much as to the Tory Ministry, that a Bill like that of Mr. Parnell should create a temporary truce. The inability of the tenants to pay rent can only be denied by bigoted political persons anxious to make capital out of the situation. The fall in agricultural prices has been revolutionary. In England it has produced effects under the gravity of which she would be overwhelmed if it were not that manufactures supply an outlet for the industry of so many of her people. Whole tracts of land, which a few years ago were highly rented, are falling back into the veriest wastes, because even the offer of obtaining them rent free does not afford sufficient temptation for Englishmen to enter on the now unprofitable occupation of farming. Abatements of rent have accordingly become universal; the only difference is in their amount. Mr. Walter Morrison, one of the most bitter of the Liberal Unionists, has given his tenants as much as sixty per cent. reduction in their rents. Mr. W. H. Smith, a member of the Administration, has given his tenants an abatement of forty per cent.; and all over England similar reductions are taking place. No one but an imbecile would argue that abatements of rent which are necessary in a rich, populous country like England, with its splendid railways, its great and innumerable markets, and its enormous manufactures, are not only necessary in Ireland with her poverty, her sparse population, her infant railway system, her few and scattered markets, and her people almost entirely dependent on agriculture. In Ireland, indeed, the case has been given up by many of the landlords themselves. Some of the most important among them, like Earl Fitzwilliam, have already given reductions of fifty per cent.; and have thus surrendered the whole case. All that was required was legislation which would compel the evil landlord to do that which the good landlord does of his own accord.

At the moment when we write, it seems as if the Tory Government would not have the good sense to adopt this policy of reason and justice; and the Irish farmers are left to fight their own battles without any assistance from the Imperial Exchequer. This creates a grave situation both for the farmers and for their leaders. The landlords in many parts of the country will do their utmost to exact the rent to the last farthing, irrespective of the ability of the tenant to pay. Indeed many of the landlords have little choice in the matter. Victims as well as tyrants, they have no longer any independence. Reduced to bankruptcy, their entire hold over their property is gone; and they have no further duty than that of affixing their

names to documents presented to them by the imperious hands of the Jew or the insurance company. Thus the Earl of Kenmare for years has had no part whatever in the management of his property, but has been compelled to live on an income of two thousand pounds a year allowed him by his creditors. It is ridiculous to expect that the Irish farmers will allow themselves to be driven from their homes by their landlords for the payment of rents that every man admits to be impossible. What will take place is probably this: The tenants on the different estates will meet, and having considered all the facts of the case, will agree to ask from their landlord the abatement which the justice and the necessities of the case demand. If the landlord agree, well and good; the whole question is settled. If the landlord refuse or the persons who act in his name, then the tenants will refuse to pay any rent at all; and will meet the war that is openly proclaimed between the two sides. The National League will be bound to come to the rescue of the tenants who fight for their families and homes, and there will begin a conflict which will be war under the name of peace. It will be impossible that a campaign of this kind can be fought without many scenes of violence; without much suffering; perhaps also without some crime. Already a respected clergyman has felt it his duty to go to prison by way of testimony to the righteousness of the cause of the tenantry of which he had constituted himself a leader. In other parts of the country, other local leaders will be found ready to sacrifice themselves; and unquestionably a situation that may well be described as desperate will thus be created. It is to be hoped that the tenantry, while defending their homes, will not be betrayed into crime; which is a weapon not in their interest, but against it. Then the difficulty of the Government will begin. Either the people will overcome them, or they will overcome the people; and this seems to point inevitably towards coercion.

A revision of rents and self-government are, of course, the true escape from this *cul-de-sac*. As to revision of rents, this must further be remembered. In all proposals with regard to the land question now, the possibility of a great scheme of land purchase must always be taken into account. Beyond doubt, that is the ultimate and the early solution which the question will have to receive. But a revision of rents will have to precede a scheme of land purchase. What is taking place in Ireland at the present hour is the best proof of this. The landlords are sending round to the tenants two documents of which they may take their choice; the one a notice of eviction—the other an agreement to buy their land under a Land Purchase Act passed last year. The meaning of this is clear; the landlords are taking advantage of the pressure of a

Tory Government, of the popular depression caused by the prospect of coercion and the inability of the farmer to pay the present rent; and utilize all these things for the purpose of forcing a bad bargain upon the tenantry. The *Daily Express*, the organ of the landlords in Dublin, revealed the whole scheme in an article it recently wrote upon Mr. Parnell's skill. No tenant, said the organ of the landlords, need be evicted if he be only reasonable. All he has to do is to consent to purchase his holding; and at once he obtains a reduction of twenty-five per cent. in his rental. This is true; for the purchase of the holding at once does reduce the rent from twenty-two to twenty-five per cent. under the Land Purchase Act. But it is scarcely necessary to point out that, notwithstanding, the purchase is a bad bargain if it take place on a rent that is too high; and any purchase that takes place now must take place on a rental that is too high. Until, then, there is a new revision of rents which will bring them down to the figure demanded by the revolution in prices, all purchases of land are bad bargains; bad alike for the Irish farmer and for the British taxpayer. These things will, of course, be brought out in debate, and will have much effect upon the English Liberals and still more upon English opinion outside. If the British masses be once convinced that the Tory Ministry are helping the Irish landlords to force bargains which will necessitate a tax upon the Imperial Exchequer, then the Ministry is undone.

Mr. Gladstone is said still to hesitate very much at reopening the settlement of 1881, and one can well understand his hesitation. Besides, he regards the question of the rent as so full of thorns that it would be very unwise of any Government to enter upon it. But the facts of the case will prove too much for his hesitation; and we fully expect that he will soon be driven to the same position as the Irish party, and join in the demand for a revision of the rents. The Radical party, at the same time, are resolved to push the controversy from Parliament to the country; and an active winter campaign is looked forward to. Every day brings the Liberal party closer to the opinions of the Irish members. The future, then, is well assured. There may be a short delay; but it is the small pause in the inevitable race which in retrospect will scarcely be remembered. In the calm review of the circumstances of the struggle which we have attempted to set forth in the preceding pages no man can find any reasonable ground for feeling anything but sanguine as to the future of the Irish cause and the early triumph of Irish nationality.

WHAT WILL BECOME OF THE INDIANS?

Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii. Baltimore :
Murphy. 1886.

Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior, for the year 1885. Washington : Government Printing Office.

THE enactments of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore concerning the better support of our Indian missions have, undoubtedly, been hailed with joy by every friend of the cause. The following is a translation of the four paragraphs (*Tit. VIII., Cap. II., 241-243*) referring to the matter :

"Holy Mother Church has won undying honor by the history of her Missions among the aboriginal population of North America. And justly so ; for, from the time of the first discoveries in the New World to the present day, a large number of her sons, impelled by apostolic zeal and charity, have, amidst the greatest hardships, preached the gospel of the Kingdom of God to those poor brethren of ours, redeemed by the blood of Christ, and worthy of the compassionate care of Mother Church.

"Accordingly, the Fathers decree, that the Committee (Indian Bureau), established in 1874, by his Grace the Most Reverend Archbishop of Baltimore, for the purpose of pleading the cause of the Indians with the Government, be maintained, with this modification, that it consist of four bishops, to be presided over by the Archbishop of Baltimore, and chosen, for a term of five years, by those prelates in whose dioceses Indian tribes are living. It will be the office of the Committee to locate at the Capital a priest, who shall act as Commissioner, and, in conformity with the rules to be laid down by the Committee, carefully conduct the matters enjoined on him by said prelates, and in general promote the welfare of the Indians, as opportunity may offer, and with the best means in his power.

"In each diocese of the country collections shall be made every year, on the first Sunday in Lent, and the proceeds forwarded to the Committee for Home Missions which shall be established. The distribution will be made as follows : The amount collected on the first Sunday of Lent in those dioceses where the Society of the Pious Work of the Propagation of the Faith is already in operation, shall be employed by the Committee entirely for the support of the Indian and Negro Missions. But, in dioceses where that society is not yet introduced, the proceeds of the collection shall be equally divided, and one-half sent to Lyons, the other retained for the Indian and Negro Missions.

"The Committee shall be established in this manner : The Most Reverend Archbishop of Baltimore will associate with himself two of those bishops whose dioceses are not in want of such aid. They will then choose for secretary a priest—say, a member of the Sulpitian Society—who shall yearly send to all the bishops an exact statement of the several collections received, and of the disposition made of the entire amount. The bishops, also, who receive a portion of those collections, will yearly inform the Committee of the number of Indians and Negroes in their dioceses, of their religious condition, and of such other matters as, in their judgment, may or must be communicated to the Committee in the interest of the cause.

"In this whole matter, which, surely, is not devoid of difficulties, the pastors, as

well as their flocks, will find themselves greatly encouraged by the affectionate interest shown to us by His Eminence the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda, who kindly expresses his readiness to furnish subsidies, as also by the indulgences granted, December 3d, 1882, by our Holy Father, Leo XIII., to certain missions, and now graciously extended to us."

If the appeal of the chief pastors meets with the hearty and generous response it deserves, and which the importance of the matter would seem to promise, a great momentum will be added to the progress of the work of conversion and civilization, begun among our Indians over three hundred years ago, and carried on with varying success, but never so promising as at the present day.

The ethnical pride of the race—in past times one of the chief obstacles to their Christianization—is, to a great extent, broken. Inter-tribal warfare has ceased. Outbreaks, or raids upon the whites, are no more to be feared. The wanton murders, once so frequently committed by a class of men, or fiends in human shape, whose motto was, "The best Indian is a dead one," are, from year to year, becoming scarcer. The prairie tribes, heretofore migratory, are, or will soon be, fixed within limits easily accessible. Most of the race are already placed in circumstances that render it well-nigh a matter of life or death for them to rely, for their support, on agriculture and other civilized pursuits. Larger numbers than ever before are not only willing, but anxious, to be instructed in the ways of the white man, including his religion.

Nor is it, as in times past, a task above the average physical strength and moral courage of man to run into the desert in quest of that stray sheep. A life of slow martyrdom, undoubtedly, still awaits the priest who devotes himself to the work of rescue; but the hardships incurred, the privations inseparable from a life of poverty and from a sojourn in more or less remote regions, the enduring patience needed for the successful performance of the Indian missionary's task, nowadays, very little differ, in many missions at least, from what every worker, in the care of souls, must be ready to brave or to practise, whether in our populous centres or among a scattered rural population. Nay, some of the difficulties and annoyances that frequently embitter the life of the latter are unknown to the laborer in the Indian mission. A particular vocation, no doubt, is required for the peculiar task; but, with such a vocation, the labor—however ungrateful it may appear at times—becomes its own reward.

One advantage, or rather an indispensable condition of complete and lasting success, utterly denied to the Franciscan and Jesuit Fathers in the heroic age of the Indian missions, and even to most of the modern pioneers, is now, or rather, with the expected suc-

cor of the faithful, will soon be, at the command of most missionaries—the inestimable help of female religious communities. The devotedness of that chosen part of Christ's flock has changed the aspect of the Indian mission, like dew of heaven falling on a parched and withering field.

Ten years ago this QUARTERLY (in its third and fourth numbers) called attention to the precarious state of some of our then existing missions in the Great Lake region, and to the pressing wants of the still larger, but practically almost abandoned, field on the western prairies. In the ears of some readers, that appeal may have sounded like a wail of despair; for it was less the lack of material aid than an apparent apathy in regard to the spiritual welfare of our red brethren, and a certain want of plan and concerted action, the writer of those articles deplored—perhaps, with too much freedom of speech. Thank God, the burning words then uttered have done no harm; nor need they be now repeated, so far at least as the field then referred to is concerned. Various causes have combined to bring about a marked change for the better; and it is chiefly the zeal and activity of the bishops whose dioceses contain portions of the aboriginal population, the ready concurrence of religious orders, both male and female, and the consequent increase in the number of laborers, that necessitate a *general* effort for the better material support of the Indian missions. Vocations, it is true, are yet far from being numerous enough for all our wants; still, the late rapid gain augurs well for the future.

To begin with the eastern portion of the territory surveyed in the articles referred to, the Ottawas, in the old mission of Little Traverse (Harbor Springs) and its dependencies, are now in charge of two Franciscan Fathers of the Recollect branch—the same order which shares the honor, with the Society of Jesus, of having been the first to visit the region of the Great Lakes. In the neighboring Crow village, two priests of the Third Order of St. Francis have been added to the missionary force; and two seculars—one of them a retired and aged bishop, doing the humble work of a pastor in a little Indian village—are stationed among the Ottawas farther south.

In Upper Michigan a new mission has just been opened for the scattered Ojibways on the shores of Lakes Huron and Michigan. In the long-established mission on Keweenaw Bay, the teaching force and the accommodations for pupils have been largely increased.

The Menominees in Wisconsin, also, have now the happiness to be under the guidance of Recollect Fathers. A large boarding-school has been put up; and one of the Fathers has given to that

tribe, who, formerly, were compelled to use books but partly intelligible to them, a prayer-book and catechism, the first works composed and printed in their language. The missionary staff consists of three priests and seven Sisters of St. Joseph.

The same Order, assisted by Franciscan Sisters and Sisters of St. Joseph, has filled the void in the Wisconsin Ojibway mission on Lake Superior. The number of Fathers engaged in it is six; of Sisters, fourteen. Here, too, one of those humble, laborious and zealous workers has added a valuable volume—a much-needed Bible history—to the religious library of that widespread tribe.¹

In Northern Minnesota, the venerable monastic order to whose labors the greater part of Europe owes its Christian civilization, has put the hand to the plough. The Ojibways of White Earth Reservation are under the paternal care of a Benedictine of the American Cassinese Congregation, while others, at Otter Tail, Winnibigoshish, Padegama and Sandy Lake, are regularly visited by a secular priest.

The most conspicuous change, however, has been wrought among the Dakotas, the dread Sioux of old. Where, ten or eleven years ago, but a single priest and a few Sisters of Charity devoted themselves to the conversion and instruction of a small portion of that great tribe, no less than five Benedictine Fathers, four secular priests and three large communities of Sisters are most successfully laboring under the guidance of a prelate who, himself the pioneer in that vast field, is intimately acquainted with all its wants. About three thousand Dakotas belong to the Church; and the fruits already reaped are but the promise of a harvest much more abundant. Nor are the Ojibways in the distant Turtle Mountain region forgotten; a secular priest has exiled himself among them.

So much concerning the field whose pressing needs were discussed in these pages ten years ago. If a proportionate increase in the number of labors and missions cannot be asserted of other fields in the West, and in the Southwest, it is at least highly gratifying to see the old established Jesuit missions in Montana, Idaho and Washington Territory remain as ever the subject of admiration and unstinted praise, on the part of the neighboring citizens and visitors from a distance, whatever their religious preferences may be. A few new missions, however, have also been opened in those regions, and in the place of four Fathers, seven or eight are now at work among the Pend d'Oreilles, Flatheads, Black Feet and Cheyennes in Montana. Quite lately one of the

¹ The book, it is true, has not yet been printed; but, with the expected assistance, it may be hoped that it will soon come out, and be in the hands of thousands of Ojibway and Ottawa readers. Most of these Indians pay for their books, but the expenses for printing and binding must be advanced by the authors.

Fathers has established himself in the Assinoboine and Gros Ventres Reservation. The Society, also, continues its labors among the Osages and Pottawattomies in Kansas and the adjacent part of Indian Territory.

Excellent progress, especially in the education of the young, is reported from Oregon. Three secular priests, assisted by Sisters of Mercy and Benedictine Nuns, are engaged in the Indian missions of that State, on the Umatilla and Grande Ronde Reservations.

The meagreness of reports from other western fields renders it impossible to give due credit to the zeal of all the prelates and the regular or secular clergy entrusted with Indian charges, and to the devotedness of their assistants, the members of female religious congregations or orders.

The mission in Indian Territory, confided since 1876 to Benedictines of the French Cassinese Congregation, appears to labor under peculiar difficulties, and partly still relies on the visits of missionaries from neighboring dioceses. Thus far, two schools, directed by Benedictine Fathers and Sisters of Mercy, are in operation.

The reports from New Mexico show a slight increase in the number of Pueblo chapels. For a dozen missions, however, but two or three priests could thus far be spared.

A singular fact—apt to put to shame the stronger sex—is reported from Arizona. Under that sultry sun a brave band of Sisters of St. Joseph, as yet unassisted by a resident priest,¹ have taken charge of the savage Yuma tribe, as teachers and local agents for the Government.

A remnant of Catholic Choctaws, in the State of Mississippi, has been lately, as it were, discovered, and provided with schools, one of them kept by Sisters of Mercy. A secular priest, fresh from Europe—which, indeed, thus far has furnished all our Indian missionaries, with hardly an exception—has made one of their villages his happy home.²

In the Northeast, the long-converted Abenakis have had the happiness, within the last decade, to see their children placed under the tuition of religious women. Eleven Sisters of Mercy conduct three schools in that section.

Finally, in what is now our true Northwest, we have just beheld a bishop, accompanied by four members of the Society of Jesus, enter the pathless wilds, to build up a mission on the Upper Yukon, where he already once before spent a dreary winter among the

¹ Since the above was written, one of the Recollect Fathers of the Wisconsin Ojibway mission has gone to fill the void.

² No mention is made of these Indians in the "Report of the Commissioner," etc. Some other small bands are also overlooked in the official census.

Alaskan hordes. Two secular priests are stationed on the Pacific coast.

If many items of progress, as is most likely, be found wanting in this rapid survey, the blame will partly fall on the good missionaries themselves, who love to labor in obscurity. They will be the last to complain of being slighted. But will it not be in the interest of the Indian missions if one of those engaged in it snatch an occasional hour from their ordinary duties, to let the public know something of their joys and their troubles, their wants and their hopes? The regular issue of missionary letters—a continuation of the Jesuit *Relations* and *Lettres Edifiantes*—would certainly rouse a more general and practical interest in the cause, and could hardly fail to stimulate vocations.¹

¹ The "Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs" for 1885 contains numerous testimonials, highly commendatory of the labors of our Indian missionaries. A few samples will be found interesting :

" Devils' Lake Agency, Fort Totten, Dakota.

"The majority of the Indians on this reservation are Catholic. The baptismal record shows 900 baptisms since the establishment of the mission, and 112 during the last year. Rev. Jerome Hunt, of the Order of St. Benedict, who speaks the Indian language fluently, is working a wonderful change amongst these people by his untiring zeal and eloquent instructions. Since his connection with the mission (three years), eighty-three marriages have been publicly solemnized in the Church, in the presence of the congregation, during divine service, and the contracting parties fully understand that death only can relieve them from their obligations, and that under no condition can they 'throw away a wife and take another.'

"The Industrial Boarding-School for Boys and Girls is conducted, under contract, by the Gray Nuns of Montreal, and has been under their management since 1874. . . . There was an average attendance at this school during the year of 61 scholars, boys and girls, who are as far advanced in their studies as boys and girls of similar ages in the States, and reflect much credit upon the Sisters and all employees connected with the school.

"MORALS.—I challenge a comparison in this respect with any community in the States, of the same size, and venture the assurance that the odds will be largely in favor of these Indians. . . .

"JOHN W. CRAMSIE,
Agent."

" Grande Ronde Agency, Oregon.

"The missionary work at this agency is still, as it has been for the last twenty-four years, under the supervision of the Reverend Father Croquet. The reverend Father is an old pioneer priest, who has spent all his time without compensation, and frequently without food and shelter, other than that furnished him by the Indians, while making his annual pastoral visits to the people of his faith, many of whom reside on the Siletz Agency, and at other points on the coast.

"T. B. SINNOTT,
Agent."

" Umatilla Agency, Oregon.

"The boarding-school, established here in 1882, is progressing well. At the exercises, held on June 26th last, at which Bishop Gross, the Archbishop of Oregon, and all the prominent persons in Pendleton and vicinity, were present, every one expressed themselves as not only highly pleased but astonished at the progress made by

All these missions, then, need help. Priests and Sisters must live. In some places, even the outfit for divine worship is incom-

the pupils. There are now 75 pupils who attend, all of them well fed, clothed, and well taken care of in all respects, owing to the more than liberal munificence of the Government. The buildings, outhouses and grounds, belonging to the school, are kept in excellent order, and the teachers and other employees are all that can be desired. The school-farm contains about 65 acres, and the industrial teacher, with the help of the older boys, had cut and stacked 25 tons of as fine wheat-hay as any in the country; in addition, an ample supply of vegetables of all kinds has been raised on the farm, and sufficient seeds are saved for planting purposes next season. The school is a credit to the Government and all concerned, the scholars are well behaved and love (as they have good reason) their teachers.

"E. J. SOMMERVILLE,
Agent."

"Colville Indian Agency, Washington Territory.

"The schools of this agency number four—two at Cœur d'Alène and two at the Colville Mission—under contract with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions. They are all industrial boarding-schools, and are faithfully taught by the Fathers of the Jesuit faith and the noble Sisters of Charity. They are all in a flourishing condition, and the outlook for the future is very bright for them. A new school building, at the Colville girls' school, has been finished, and is now ready for occupancy. These school buildings are built entirely at the expense of the mission, and the pupils are maintained (board, clothes and tuition), at an expense to the Government of only \$108 per year for each pupil. This compensation is wholly inadequate to maintain these pupils, and, were it not for the means derived from other sources by the mission, they could not possibly be cared for at the present rate. They should, at least, be allowed \$150 per annum, which is much less than what it costs to support pupils in Government schools not under contract.

"The same earnest zeal for the welfare of the Indians, wherever dispersed, has characterized the labors of the Jesuit Fathers during the past year. Night or day, in summer's heat or winter's cold, they are ready at the call of the Master above—ready to do their duty, without the hope of fee or reward. Their influence has been great with the Indian tribes of the Northwest, in preserving peaceful relations between the Indians and the whites. May they ever remain among the Indians of this agency, is my earnest and heartfelt prayer. The noble, self-sacrificing Sisters of Charity, who are in charge of the girls' school at Cœur d'Alène and at Colville, have been severely taxed in their efforts to erect school buildings at both places; but they have succeeded in having two very fine buildings built for the better accommodation of their pupils. They are sowing seed among these children, which will bear much fruit in after-life.

"SIDNEY D. WATERS,
United States Indian Agent."

The following is found in the "Report of the Sub-committee of the Special Committee of the United States Senate," appointed to visit the Indian tribes in Northern Montana in 1883. It refers to the *Jesuit Mission of St. Ignatius among the Flatheads*.

"The schools have now 100 scholars, about equally divided between the two sexes, and the Government pays \$100 annually for the board, tuition, and clothing of each scholar, to the number of 80. The boys and girls are in separate houses, the former under a corps of five teachers (three Fathers and two lay-brothers), and the girls under three Sisters and two half-Sisters, Father Van Gorp being at the head of the institution. The children are taught reading and writing, arithmetic, grammar and geography, and the recitations, all in the English language, are equal to those of the white children in the States, of the same age. The mission has a saw and grist mill and planing and shingle machine, worked by the boys, several hundred head of cattle and horses, and 300 acres of land belonging to the mission, cultivated successfully by the male scholars, the product being sufficient to furnish enough wheat and oats and vegetables

plete, or lamentably poor. The missionaries have to build their own houses and chapels; and, where the Government day-schools are used for proselytizing purposes, also the schoolhouses. Boarding-schools should be established wherever practicable, and those already existing improved and enlarged. Much remains to be done in this respect, especially for the male youth. Besides, a number of new missions ought to be erected among pagan tribes, as well as in abandoned old fields, where poorly instructed Catholics are in danger of relapsing into superstition, or becoming estranged from the faith by the exertions of non-Catholic agents and teachers.

But, after all this will have been made known to our people, some will yet be inclined to ask questions. Even among the overburdened clergy, a few may be tempted to demur. The faithful, it will be said, have to provide for so many pressing needs of their own. Will their alms produce fruit sufficiently abundant to justify the additional effort now demanded of them? Is not the whole Indian race doomed to extinction? And will not all attempts to civilize the red man produce, as heretofore, but meagre results, or end in complete failure?

There is but one answer to these questions: *Our Indians will live and be civilized.*

To be more explicit, a few of the smaller tribes, or fragments of tribes, will probably disappear without a trace. A larger number may live on, indefinitely, in their present strength, or with a slight increase. The bulk of our Indians will, indeed, sooner or later cease to exist *as a distinct race*; but their hybrid descendants—finally to be absorbed, with the rest of our heterogeneous population, in the great North American people—will, in ever-increasing numbers, form a comparatively small, but by no means unimportant percentage of our general population.

As to civilization, the culture of full-blood individuals and separate communities will, indeed, never be that of the white race. But

for all purposes. The girls are also taught by the Sisters, besides the branches we have mentioned, music, sewing, embroidery and housekeeping. For a time the school was only for females, and the result was, that the young women, after being educated, married ignorant half-breeds or Indians, and, unable to withstand the ridicule of their companions, relapsed into a barbarism worse, if possible, than that of husband and tribe. Now, after the establishment of the department for males, the young people, when they leave school, intermarry, and each couple becomes a nucleus for civilization and religion in the neighborhood where they make their home, the Fathers and agent assisting them in building a house and preparing their little farm for raising a crop. We cannot sufficiently commend this admirable school, and we do not envy the man who can see only a mercenary object or any but the highest and purest motives which can actuate humanity in the self-sacrificing devotion of the noble men and women, fitted by talents and accomplishments of the highest order to adorn any walk in life, who are devoting their lives to the education of these Indian children."

the red man is not an irredeemable savage ; and the experience gained by former failures, the increased facilities and better means at the command of those engaged in the work, and the more general and growing sympathy with the "wards of the nation," are a sure promise of a rapid and solid improvement in their social state and general culture. The ultimate civilization of that large portion of the race which will be absorbed by the white population is, of course, but a question of time.

Finally, if the future of our Indians from the religious point of view be put to question, it may be safely asserted that large numbers will soon be weaned from heathen belief and practices by the combined exertions of our civil government and the various denominations engaged in the mission ; but how many of them and their descendants, down to the remotest ages, will have the happiness to live and die as members of the mystical body of Christ, will depend on the fidelity with which we shall acquit ourselves of our duty, and, consequently, to a large extent, on the response our people are going to make to the appeal of their chief pastors for the support of the Indian missions.

The several assertions included in the above general answer must be subjected to a more detailed consideration.

I.

The question as to the vitality of the North American Indians has been brought a long step nearer its solution by the critical study of all available documents relating to the distribution and numerical strength of the tribes east of the Mississippi and south the St. Lawrence and the great lakes, before the middle of the 16th century.¹ In the place of the many millions of the popular belief, that Indian population was found to have been below 180,000 souls. Under the operation of accidental causes, not likely to occur again on a large scale—such as wars, both inter-tribal and with the whites, wanton slaughter, wide-spread diseases, migrations, and forced removals—their descendants had, towards the middle of the present century, been reduced to about 120,000 souls. From that period to this day they have, on the whole, been steadily gaining ; and the same holds good of the bulk of western Indians not included in the above calculation.²

¹ The Former and Present Number of our Indians, by Brevet Lieut.-Col. Garrick Mallory.

² According to the "Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs" for 1885, the Indian population in the United States, exclusive of Alaska, amounts to 259,244, while in 1880 it was 256,127, showing the trifling gain of 3117 souls in five years. And even this slight increase would appear to have been anything but steady. The report of 1881 shows a gain of 5724, that of the following year a loss of 2219 ; in 1883 there appears another gain of 5933 ; in 1884 a loss of 1565 ; in 1885, of 4756.

Now, all this looks very suspicious ; and so does the fact that *over one-half* of the

The number of tribes, or disjointed and isolated fragments of tribes, whose absolute extinction in the near future appears probable, is insignificant, and favorable circumstances may yet save some of them. The chief causes of their steady decrease are partly moral degradation and hereditary taints, partly frequent inter-marriage of near relatives—the consequence of their isolated position and small numbers. On the whole, the Indians are not an unprolific race; but their habits of life, even in the more advanced stages of culture, are not favorable to rapid increase. Hence, any additional causes tending to lessen the number of births, or to heighten the death-rate, are apt to bring about a stand-still, or a retrogressive motion, as to numbers. But those causes being removed, the case will be reversed. Thus, moral improvement through the means of healthy religious influences, and intermarriage with individuals of other tribes, or with whites, may in the case of some of the declining tribes yet become the means of arresting the downward course. Whether such a result be desirable or not, from the point of view of national economy, is of little concern in our present inquiry. Those poor people stand in need of succor as much as the healthier and more prosperous tribes, and no diffi-

last great loss (4756) occurred in a *single agency*. According to the returns of the last six years, the Cheyennes and Arapahoes, in Indian Territory, numbered respectively 5899, 6455, 6569, 6496, 6271, and 3609 souls. The loss of 2662 souls in one year—43 per cent.—without any extraordinary cause to account for it, exceeds the limit of credibility. At this rate, that agency would become a sinecure in a very few years. The medical statistics of those two tribes show but 222 deaths, or $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in the same year.

Similar suspicious figures occur in the census of the Assinoboinés and Gros Ventres of Fort Belknap Agency, Montana, who numbered 2150 souls in 1884, and but 1552 in 1885, a loss of 28 per cent.; and in the census of the Yankton Sioux, of Fort Peck Agency, Montana, who were reduced from 3542, in 1884, to 2332, in 1885, losing 34 per cent. in a year of comparatively good health. The medical statistics of these two agencies show a loss by death of, respectively, but 50 and 77 souls, in the same year. Another statistical freak occurs in the tables referring to progress in civilization, etc. In these the number of Indians (exclusive of the “nations” in Indian Territory) who could read in 1882 is stated to have been 14,532. In the following year there were but 14,399 such scholars; and this, in spite of the fact that 1889 individuals had learned to read within those twelve months. To explain this puzzle, we should assume that out of 16,421 Indian readers as many as 2022 died in one year,—12 per cent.—an impossible death-rate for persons above at least six years, as they all must have been. In 1884 there were, again, 18,185 readers, a gain of 3786; and still we are informed that the number of those who *learned* to read within that year was but 2257.

The cause of most of these statistical absurdities is, in all likelihood, the manner in which many of the agents prepare their yearly returns. Instead of making an actual count, the number of births, deaths and other items, more or less carefully ascertained is added to (or deducted from) the figures of each preceding year, though primarily these figures may have been mere estimates or based on incorrect enumerations, or on fraudulent returns. As soon, then, as an honest census is taken, such strange discrepancies as those pointed out above make their appearance. Such a census appears to have been, in many agencies, that of 1885. Hence the decrease of the Indian population in that year may safely be assumed to be merely apparent.

culty should make us shrink from attempting their spiritual rescue. Has not the Church ever shown a mother's heart in her dealings with the poor and miserable, and most despised of the world?

Among the tribes whose statistics show a stationary condition or a slow increase, a certain number located in regions not likely soon, or ever, to attract white settlers,—such, for instance, as large portions of Alaska and Arizona,—have a fair prospect to continue as a distinct race for centuries to come. Let them be brought under the fostering care of the Church, and they will be as happy people as any on earth,—poor, of little account in the great material concerns of the nation, but oases of peace and contentment. And many a bright soul will wing her way up out of the wilderness, thanking her distant brethren for the helping hand. The sooner, then, we enter upon such ground, the better for those Indians and the more creditable to the children of the Church in this country.

The larger number of our Indians, however, belong to that portion of the race which, after the lapse of centuries, will exist but in the person of their hybrid descendants. This will be the fate of all those tribes that own valuable land, or live in close proximity to neighborhoods adapted to agriculture or other industries. Within a few decades most of them will be—as many already are—scattered among, or surrounded on all sides by, permanent white settlers. Intermarriages will become more frequent, and illicit intercourse, alas, will hardly anywhere be entirely wanting. There are already some neighborhoods and smaller tribes where scarcely a full-blood individual can be found. Among others the mixed-bloods form a considerable majority. Wherever the above-mentioned conditions exist, we see the process of amalgamation going on with more or less rapidity, and it is strange that this fact has been so little adverted to by writers on the “Indian problem.”

In the “struggle for existence” that will ensue wherever that crowding of the races will take place, a large number of full-bloods, and even many of their immediate descendants, must succumb. The *ratio* of decimation will depend on causes beyond present calculation, such as the greater or lesser wisdom of governmental measures for the protection of the Indians, and the degree of faithfulness, on the part of subaltern officers, in executing them; the character of the religious bodies laboring for their conversion; the morals and more or less friendly disposition of their white neighbors. The innate capabilities of the divers tribes, and the degree of culture acquired by them when the struggle begins, will, of course, also greatly modify the result. Some tribes, or portions of tribes, will fare worse than others. Some of the smaller may disappear, leaving hardly a trace; but of all the larger ones full-blood

representatives, though in ever-decreasing numbers, will be seen among us, perhaps for centuries to come. Their mixed-blood descendants will, for a still longer time, form a more or less perceptible element of population in those sections of the country where the larger tribes are now, or will soon be, permanently located,—until the day comes when the physical and intellectual traits of their Indian ancestors will become all but obliterated, and when some of the most prominent men of the nation will boast of the Cherokee, or Dakota, or Ojibway blood that runs in their veins.¹

¹ The subjoined table will show to what extent the process of absorption has already gone on in some of the tribes or fragments of tribes.

Name of Tribe.	Full Bloods.	Mixed Bloods.	Percentage of Mixed Bloods. (The decimals are neglected.)
Wyandotte, Quapaw Agency, I. T., . . .	12	251	95
Ottawa, " " . . .	7	110	94
Seneca, " " . . .	50	189	79
Turtle Mountain Chippewa, Dakota, . . .	183	731	79
Chippewa and Ottawa, Michigan, . . .	3800	5700	60
Iroquois, New York, . . .	2890	2080	58
Stockbridge and Menominee, Wisconsin, . . .	667	774	53
Chippewa in Wisconsin and Minnesota, . . .	2409	1247	34
Chippewa, Munsee, Iowa, . . .	661	305	31
Kikapoo, Pottawatomie, Sac and Fox, of Great Nemaha Agency, Kansas, . . .			
Osage, Kaw, and Quapaw, Osage Ag., I. T., . . .	1464	433	22
Omaha and Winnebago, Om. and Win. Agency, Nebraska, . . .	1952	550	22
Walla Walla, Cayuse, and Umatilla, Oregon, . . .	730	166	18
Flatheads, Kootenais, and Pends d'Oreille, Montana, . . .	1816	250	13
	16,641	12,786	43

At the head of this list, it will be perceived, stand the descendants of the Huron clan (Wyandotte, Wendat, Tionontate) which, *with about the same numbers*, formed Father Marquette's congregation in Michilimackinac (1671-73), and remained there till the beginning of the last century, when they went to Detroit, and afterwards to Sandusky, from whence they were moved to Indian Territory. The first intermixture with whites may have occurred over two hundred years ago. During their stay on Detroit River and Sandusky Bay, a number of their daughters undoubtedly became members of white families who did not follow them to their last retreat, and whose descendants are now probably living in Canada, Michigan and Ohio. The twelve surviving full-blood representatives of the tribe are most likely old persons, and at the end of this century not one of them may be left. Thus the history of that remarkable little clan may be considered as typical of the fate of a great part of the Indian race in the United States.

The Ottawas and Chippewas (Ojibwa, Ojibway) have also been more or less in contact with whites for over two hundred years, especially in Upper Michigan and the neighboring part of Canada, where the percentage of mixed bloods is probably up to 90. The hybrid portion of these two (nearly related) tribes far outnumbers their full-blood ancestors of 200 years ago, and in some neighborhoods the *ratio* of their increase is little below that of the whites. The assertion of their agent (in Michigan) that in 50 years the race will be extinct, can only be understood as referring to the full-blood portion, and even in regard to them it is a great exaggeration.

The material civilization of these dissolving tribes will, of course, take care of itself. It will be that of their surroundings, more or less. But what of their Christian civilization? What will be the fate of so many thousands of souls, capable, as we are, of the supernatural union with God through Christ? That will, in a great measure, depend on the religious or irreligious influences which may be brought to bear on the present rude, but simple and pliant race,—influences that are likely to determine the fate of their most distant descendants.

Our responsibility, from this point of view, is evident. The salvation of hundreds of thousands of souls is, in a manner, placed in our hands. Unborn millions appeal to our charity, as did once the children of Erin in the vision of a certain "holy youth." The question, then, can only be: Will Indians ever become true Christians? Utter barbarians are incapable of leading a Christian life. As grace presupposes nature, so grace unfolding in a godly life presupposes a normally developed nature. Is the full blood-Indian capable of such development? This question brings us to the second part of our inquiry.

II.

Is the Indian race capable of civilization? An unqualified answer, whether in the affirmative or in the negative, is fraught with practical danger. If you recognize no civilization besides that of the white man, or the Anglo-Saxon, our red brethren will forever remain out of its pale. Any attempt to raise a community of full-blood Indians, or even their immediate half-caste descendants, upon that high level, will prove a failure, if not a positive injury to them. Still, the Indians, like every other inferior race, are capable of civilization, that is, a civilization of their own. There are certain physical and mental race characteristics which, in the ordinary course of nature, will never be lost or transcended. Thus the civilization of even so nearly related races as the several members of the so-called Indo-European family is not, and will never be, exactly the same. With the red man the case is worse. He is not merely dissimilar, or standing on a different, though equally elevated, plane; the Indian is not by any means the equal of the white man, either intellectually or physically. You may educate picked individuals to the semblance of cultured white men and women of ordinary ability, and hold them up as a living demonstration of the capacity of the race; and in a certain sense you are right; the Indian is not a savage inaccessible to culture and refinement, such as he has been portrayed by some writers. But let those Europeanized or Americanized Indians be placed on their own feet, whether singly or as a community, and they will fail to achieve what whites, similarly educated and circumstanced, would

be likely to accomplish. Their inbred defects, such as slowness of thought, want of mental energy and grasp, incapacity of persistent effort, lack of self-reliance, inability to grapple with complicated problems, and more or less indolence, will prevent them from making an efficient use of their accomplishments.

Educated Indians left to shift for themselves will, under favorable circumstances, fare as the vegetables of our gardens when remanded to the freedom of nature. Under untoward circumstances their fate will be that of tropical plants exposed to the rigor of an unwonted climate. When placed in the lists with white competitors of average ability, the best trained Indians will soon be left behind in the race; and if those competitors happen to be as much their inferiors in honesty as they excel them in shrewdness and persistency—a case of not unfrequent occurrence—the poor Indians will soon be driven to the wall, crushed, and ground to powder. And thus the proof will be furnished that the race is incapable of civilization.

The so-called civilized tribes or “nations” in the Indian Territory form no proof to the contrary. The work, both bodily and mental, which, in that exceptionally favored region, keeps up the semblance of American civilization, is chiefly done by whites, and to some extent by mixed-bloods; and proportionately with the increase of the latter, the full-blood Indians are losing ground, and will eventually disappear, as in other sections of the country.¹

¹ “The Cherokees, Choctaws, Chickasaws, Creeks, and Seminoles, composing this agency, it is estimated, number about 65,000, *including white and colored adopted citizens. The number of full-blood Indians is decreasing*, while the increased number of mixed-bloods, and the adopted white and colored citizens make the population about the same from year to year. The number of whites is increasing. The cause of this increase is, that the work done in the country is by whites, and not by Indians. *The mixed-bloods will work some, but the full-bloods hardly ever.* Under the laws of the country a citizen is entitled to all the land he may have improved. An arrangement is easily made with a white man who will make a farm for an Indian and give him a portion of the crops for the use of his name, and after a few years give him possession of the farm. Thus it is that more farms mean more white men. The number of whites within this agency who are laborers for Indians, employés of railroad companies, licensed traders, pleasure-seekers, travellers, and intruders, must be about 35,000, or half the number of Indians.” “Report of the Commissioners,” etc., for 1884, p. 98. Evidently the very excellency of their land is one of the causes of the decrease of the full-blood population; idle people will not thrive.

“The citizens of the nation are composed of many classes and grades. The Cherokee nation will illustrate the other nations. Her citizens are full-blood Cherokees; half-blood Cherokees to one-sixty-fourth Cherokees and white stock; Cherokee crossed on Creek, on Choctaw, on Chickasaw, etc., and on the African stock; adopted citizens of the Cherokee nation—full-blood Shawnees, full-blood Delawares, full-blood Creeks, *full-blood white men*, full-blood African, and the same stock variously blended with Cherokees and with other races, including Creeks, Choctaws, Osages, Chickasaws. The much larger part of the nation is of Cherokee blood, about 5000 full-blood, and 8000 mixed-blood Cherokees, and about 5000 of the other races mentioned.” From the report of the agent in “Report of the Commissioner,” etc., for 1885. (The italics are ours.)

Indians are, with rare exceptions, but indifferent brain-workers. They are easily fatigued and diverted from the business in hand, and need more rest than most white men. Hence, though able and, if properly encouraged, also willing to work, they must not be expected to do the work of the stronger and more highly gifted race. They are, as compared with us, mere children, and must be treated as children. This is the shortest expression of the experience gained with them by half a century of all sorts of trials, well-meant but ill-devised experiments, partial successes, and numerous failures. If treated on that principle, with the benevolence, firmness, unremittent care and patience needed in the treatment of children, the remnants of the race in the United States, and their descendants, may yet be elevated to a state of comparative prosperity. They must never be presumed to have outgrown the need of the leading strings. As long as there are Indians in the country, we shall have wards, and as a nation we should be thankful for the fact; for much remains to be done to redeem the national honor, and make amends for the sins committed, whether through lack of wisdom or from want of love, against the original occupants of our magnificent domain.

In this respect it is encouraging to see the gradual improvement in the relations between the Government and its Indian ward. In the earlier part of the century we treated the red man as an incorrigible savage, unfit to enjoy life in the close neighborhood of the superior race, who needed his fertile lands. If unwilling to go at our bidding, we removed the tribes by force. This, of course, simply postponed the solution of the problem. Civilization followed the Indians apace, and on our westward march we met still others whom we had hardly known by name. The system of removal, it was clear, could not be kept up indefinitely. Thus came the period of purchases and treaties; and with strange inconsistency we began to deal with those savages as if they were not merely our equals, but rather our superiors in intellect, experience, and readiness of adaptation to unwonted circumstances. We put gold in their hands, we gave them ploughs, we sent them teachers. With our money we fostered their gambling propensities, their improvidence, their idleness, their love of drink. Grown up in *their* habits, would *we* have done better? Our agricultural tools were of as much use to most of them as they would be to the white trapper or fisherman. As long as people are able to make both ends meet and provide for their accustomed wants, by following an easy and congenial trade, they will hardly embroil themselves with what they believe, or upon a short trial actually find, to be more irksome and for the unskilled also less profitable. The Government's *employé*, it is true, was there to show them the use of the imple-

ments and the beauty of farming. Was not his an enviable position, and apt to stimulate the ambition of his savage pupils? Indeed it was; and few of those savages would have refused to take his place, with a handsome salary to live upon and paid help to do most of the work. But the schoolmaster? Did not he at least faithfully labor to enlighten the budding minds of the rising generation? Imagine a third or fourth-rate Chinese pedagogue, ignorant of the first word of English, sent from Canton to San Francisco, to imbue its street Arabs with the wisdom of Confucius, and let him to that end teach Mandarin Chinese, a few hours a day, to small and irregular audiences, his success will be about on a par with that of many of our Indian teachers within the last thirty or forty years.

Had the Indians become civilized by the methods so long employed by the Government, that very fact would prove them our very superiors in natural endowment and quickness of adaptation. But having profited so little by the money most injudiciously distributed among them in return for their land, and by all the care bestowed upon them in accordance with unwise treaties, they again became, in the public opinion, the incorrigible sluggards and irredeemable savages of yore.

Fortunately, this is but one side of the picture. All has not been failure. Among the agents of the Government, some were fit for the position, honest, kindly disposed, men of judgment and energy. With the red man's almost intuitive knowledge of character, the charges of such agents soon learned to esteem and trust them, and with their advice and efficient aid, made considerable progress in agriculture and other civilized pursuits. In some sections the neighborhood of a better class of white settlers also operated as a stimulus. Nor did all the whites that here and there intermarried with the tribes belong to that despicable class of "squaw men" whose chief business appears to be to teach the Indians all the vices of the white man, with none of his good qualities. Of the influence exerted by a part, at least, of the missionaries, it is needless to speak. The progress thus made by a goodly number of individuals and families in many of the tribes showed both the capacity of the race for culture, and the conditions on which success depends.

With regard to the instruction of the Indian youth, light has also gradually dawned upon the minds of our agents, commissioners, and legislators. A little spelling, reading, and writing in a tongue utterly unintelligible or imperfectly understood, is no longer expected to neutralize the education of the wigwam or the tipi; nor is the most strongly-expressed desire of Indian parents to see their children grow up in the ways of the white man, believed to work as a charm and enable them to impart to their off-

spring what they do not possess themselves. Hence the Government has, in imitation of the system inaugurated by the Jesuit Fathers, established a number of boarding-schools—"reservation boarding-schools,"—and "training-schools" at a distance from the tribes. And as it became understood that Indians must be civilized by labor, not by books, the instruction in agriculture, trades, and domestic work has been placed in the foreground, while the other studies are greatly facilitated by the pupils finding themselves in constant contact with English-speaking persons. In many day schools, too, industrial and agricultural lessons have been added to the other branches to the extent of making some of them partly self-supporting. The really surprising achievements of many of the children and young men and women—partly taken from the wildest tribes—being witnessed by numerous visitors and attested by the press, are beginning to create a more favorable public opinion; and we may look forth, in the near future, for a great extension of the boarding and training-school system. A certain percentage of the educated youth, returning among tribes still unfit to value their accomplishments and profit by them, will be apt to suffer shipwreck; others will do but little towards the elevation of their less-favored brethren. Still, on the whole, the system will work well as far as material civilization is concerned; it will hasten the culture of the tribes and their manifest destiny—the mingling of the races.

Another error in our dealing with the Indians, which here and there has done great harm, is also happily becoming more and more recognized by all disinterested advisers of the Administration. This is the belief that Indians having reached a certain degree of civilization may safely be allowed the rights of American citizens in regard to the alienation of property; that is, of their individual shares of the tribal allotments. Unless protected by stringent laws, almost every Indian holder of valuable real estate will be turned out of house and farm as soon as his property becomes a tempting morsel for the cupidity of the white man. While marketable land remains in his hands he will be tempted to accept advances on it. This enables him to follow his bent for idleness and drink, and, having lost the last acre, the poor, demoralized wretch will almost invariably find himself reduced to the condition of a vagabond and a beggar. The Indian—it cannot be too much emphasized—is and remains a child as compared with the white man, and in the midst of the stronger but by no means implacable race, can hold no other position but that of a ward of the Government, which alone is able to protect him against himself and the cupidity of his white neighbors. Hence it is encouraging to see that the Administration, though inclined to allow the individual

members of tribes land in severalty, is becoming more and more reluctant to grant them land in fee simple. If this condition, as may be hoped, be strictly adhered to, a strong check will be placed against the degradation of tribes that own valuable land, large numbers of Indians will become agriculturists, their extinction will be indefinitely postponed, and the result of the gradual absorption, wherever it is to take place, will be a healthier and altogether better stock of mixed bloods.

The measure referred to, of allotting land in severalty, if carried out as far as practicable, will tend to put an end to the system of massing large, inactive bodies and furnishing them a living off-hand,—a system excusable, nay, necessary, as a temporary measure, in the case of removals and in consequence of the extinction of game, but always injurious to the moral and physical health of its victims, and, if kept up for years, absolutely ruinous. In this regard it is a pleasure to read the reports of some agents, contrasting the state of farming and partly or wholly self-supporting Indians with that of their herded and fed brethren. These reports—with some allowance here and there to be made for exaggerations—would, if more generally known, go far to dispel the widespread prejudice regarding the incapacity of the race for any respectable degree of civilization.

Other signs of improvement in the management of the Reservation Indians are the more decided and energetic action taken by the better class of agents against gambling, against certain dances,—such as the Dakota sun-dance,—and similar exciting and barbarous customs; the prohibition, wherever practical, of polygamy, and the establishment of Indian police and native courts for the prevention and punishment of crimes and misdemeanors. Most agents cheerfully attest the goodwill and intelligence with which the tribes, even the very rudest, have availed themselves of those institutions for their social improvement.¹

¹ The following testimonials by Indian agents (in "Report of the Commissioner," etc.) will surprise many a reader:

Mohaves and Chemihueves.

"They are peaceably disposed. No fighting or quarreling has come to my knowledge, and I have not had occasion to reprimand any for disorderly conduct. Sobriety is universal among these Indians; no cases of larceny. My orders have been obeyed with promptness and apparently without reluctance." (p. 1.)

Pimas.

"A better class of children to train and teach could hardly be found. . . . Once in school the children are tractable, interested, not more indolent than white children, and the desire to learn and improve constantly increases." (p. 3.)

Dakotas (Crow Creek Agency).

"The children are remarkably docile and gentle, learn readily, and make progress satisfactorily." (p. 21.)

We now arrive at the most important question, the religious. On this field, too, failures—partial, at least—have been so frequent that in the eyes of many, even well-disposed persons, the very history of the Indian missions would seem to prove the hopeless degradation of the tribes or the utter incapacity of the race for true Christian civilization. To examine the causes of that indifferent success, as far as it may have been depending upon defective doctrine and upon the want of capacity and disinterestedness on the part of the religious teachers, lies beyond the scope of the present discussion. It is our own experience on this field that chiefly concerns us, and there we meet with the fact that wherever the Church, *especially as represented by her religious orders*, has been allowed to bring to bear her full and untrammelled action upon any of the

(Fort Berthold Agency.)

“The conduct of the Indians on this Reservation for the past year has been, indeed, remarkable. I am sure there is not, nor could there be produced, a band of so many whites among whom so little crime has been committed.” (p. 29.)

Crows.

“I am pleased to be able to commend the Crows for being a temperate people. There are but few who are fond of strong drink. Some of the young men may be worse when absent from the Reservation than they are at home, but I have only found it necessary to punish Indians in two instances in nearly four years for being intoxicated or for having intoxicating liquors in their possession. This is not because they could not get it. They can get all they want at any time. But they have no desire for it.” (p. 123.)

Cœur d'Alènes.

“The Cœur d'Alènes, on the Cœur d'Alène Reserve, in Idaho, are flourishing in the highest degree, being wholly independent of the Government save in the support of their schools and the instruction they receive from their farmer. . . . Some half dozen of them have two hundred acres of land under cultivation already.” (p. 183.)

From the “Report,” etc., of 1884 :

Dakotas (Devil's Lake Agency).

“The Indians are very anxious to know if the Great Father intends to purchase their wheat again this year for making flour to feed the Chippewas. The Sioux and Chippewas have been enemies from time immemorial until a few years ago, and the Sioux feel proud that they are now able to raise grain to feed their old enemies, and often speak of it. They informed Inspector Gardner, when here a short time ago, in proof of their civilization and advancement, that ‘instead of going on the war path to procure Chippewa scalps, we stay at home and till the soil, and furnish, from our surplus, bread for the Chippewas, for we are instructed by our missionaries of the black gown to forgive our enemies and love one another, so you can see with your own eyes that we are farmers and trying to be Christians also.’” (p. 31.)

(Yankton Agency.)

“As among white men, all are not good, but I unhesitatingly say, based upon close observation and daily contact with them, that there are less idle, worthless men among them than are found in one of our villages of equal population. Some of my Indian farmers have inspired me with great respect. In personal dress and appearance, as also in good sense and pleasant manners, they are the equal of some of our prominent Western white farmers.” (p. 60.)

tribes, and *where the proper methods were employed*, the most consoling results have been obtained. It is in regard to the method, chiefly, that mistakes have been made, and with the experience gained by those errors we shall be able, God helping, to prosecute the work with increasing success. A particular instance will not be out of place as an illustration.

About thirty years ago an aged missionary knelt before the altar of the chapel in which he had baptized and instructed several hundred Indians once steeped in vice and heathenish superstition. After ten years of apparently most successful labor he had been obliged to leave his little flock, and those new Christians had now for two years been partly deprived of spiritual succor, partly under incompetent guidance. Being once more among his children, who filled the chapel, the old father began to recite for them the accustomed morning-prayers; but soon his sonorous voice became husky, his breast began to heave, his tongue to falter. With a powerful effort that strong-nerved man strove to subdue an emotion entirely unusual with him on such occasions. He partly succeeded in suppressing the outward signs of his high-wrought feelings, but the whole prayer was a combat with sobs, and we all felt relieved when the end came. What had thus filled his soul to overflowing? Was it joy for being once more, if but for a day, in the midst of his beloved Indians? It was the thought of the change that, within the short space of two years, had been wrought in the moral and religious state of that dearly-bought flock—a change of which he had, on the previous evening, obtained indubitable evidence. Alas! had that saintly man been gifted with keener sight, he could have foreseen the fate of his abandoned flock. It was but his personal influence, his holy example, his watchfulness, his charity that had so long sustained the strength and fervor of most of his neophytes. The prop being withdrawn, the fence removed, that tender plant sank to the ground and the beasts of the field came to trample upon it.

It would have fared differently with that mission had the founder been a member of an Order ever supplied with able workers to fill vacancies, and had it been in his power to procure for the children of the congregation the blessing of religious teachers. He had himself taught school, and few grew up without a fair knowledge of reading in their own language; but the boys learned no more of agriculture than their fathers, and the girls little else than what their mothers knew of thrift and cleanliness. That remarkable *pioneer* lacked one accomplishment, as necessary for an Indian *pastor* as zeal and charity. He knew nothing of farming. The land he had wisely enough secured for his flock lay idle. Fishing and hunting remained the chief occupations of his converts, with the

unavoidable accompaniments of idleness and roving, doubly dangerous under the changed circumstances—the ever-increasing contact with whites and the consequent facilities for obtaining ardent spirits.

And what has become of those poor Indians? A band of paupers and vagabonds? Such might have been their fate but for a rare good fortune. Providence sent them a pastor whose early education had not been exclusively scientific. With scanty help from outside, but with great practical knowledge and indomitable perseverance, he set about doing himself what he wished his Indians to do—tilling the land, raising stock, planting fruit trees, building houses. *Exempla trahunt.* Most of the Indians in that mission are now farming on a small scale. The children are under the tuition of devoted Sisters, as many of the girls as the limited means allow being raised in the convent, together with white children. With the help of the forthcoming Lenten alms the pastor's long-planned agricultural and industrial school for boys may yet become a reality. In the meantime the young men know that they must give good proofs of sobriety and industry before they may ask for the hand of one of the well-trained young women. Not every converted band of Indians has fared so well. Let us turn to a sad instance in point.

In the earlier part of this century, when the entire territory which now forms the dioceses of Detroit, Grand Rapids, Fort Wayne, Chicago, and Milwaukee, was travelled over by two or three missionaries, devoting their attention to both natives and thinly-scattered white settlers, quite a number of Indians, belonging to one of the more developed branches of the Algonic family, were brought into the fold and not badly instructed. The work of evangelization was interrupted by the forced removal of the tribe. A few scores of Christian families, however, having bought land, were allowed to remain in their ancient home. They built a church, and have never since been entirely destitute of spiritual succor. But the visiting missionaries, being encumbered with the charge of white congregations, could pay them but passing attention, and never learned their language. As time went on every remaining acre in that section—excellent land—was bought up by immigrants from the East, and more of it was needed. *That soil was too good for Indians.* To drive them out was not practicable. To shoot them down would have been unchristian and dangerous. But those simple people loved fine horses, shining broadcloth, glittering apparel; nor were any of them averse to the social cup. All these luxuries, together with the ordinary staff of life, they were liberally supplied with by their Christian neighbors, against mortgages, of course, on their goodly “forties” and “eighties.” The result need

not be described. A remnant of the band still linger around their old chapel, gaining a poor livelihood by plaiting baskets and gathering berries. They cling to the faith, and each visit of the priest is a holiday with them. But their life is sapped, with the exception of a few who have withstood the temptation and still hold property; they are wrecks, physically and morally. Few children are born or survive. They have no future in this world.

Compare the state of that forlorn band with the thrift, the happiness, the hopeful future of Indian flocks such as the Flatheads of St. Ignatius, in Montana, that from the day of their gathering in were carefully and lovingly watched over, instructed, protected, and it will become apparent where the causes of failures must be sought for—not in the natural incapacity of the race, but partly in the defective methods employed, partly in untoward exterior circumstances. With our riper experience, then, and with our prospective ampler means, deficiencies will be supplied, errors avoided, and, against dangers from the outside, the improved public feeling and the wiser measures of the civil government may, to a certain extent, be relied upon as offering a more efficient protection. Altogether, if we but do our duty, the future of our Indian missions is more cheering than it ever was.

But we are not alone in the field. With a large number of our non-Catholic fellow-citizens the more or less of Christian tradition and sentiment which they still retain is working as a ferment of proselytizing activity. Their religious zeal finds a natural ally in the philanthropic tendencies of the age, and the hearty aid of the Administration and its *employés* can almost invariably be counted upon by Protestant parties engaged in the Indian missions. In some quarters the very dislike of the Catholic name would seem to form an additional stimulus. Still, it cannot be doubted that a vast amount of real goodness of heart and noble devotion enter into the exertions of non-Catholic parties for the Christianization of the Indians. Add to this our own lamentable remissness in seizing the opportunities of the past, and it will be no matter of surprise if we find a large portion of the field preoccupied by the emissaries of the sects. And most of them are probably gaining a number of those simple people for their various forms of belief or opinion. The want of official statistics and the usual vagueness of Protestant missionary reports render it impossible to form a measurably exact estimate of the result of their labors; but there is no doubt that the teaching force employed by Protestantism, directly and indirectly, for moulding the minds of the Indians, largely exceeds our own.

In Indian Territory, for instance, the Methodist Church South, the Presbyterian Missionary Board, the Congregational Society,

the Southern Baptist, the Presbyterian, and the Baptist Home Missionary Societies maintain or manage no less than seven academies, four seminaries, and one university. Besides, whatever of religious influence may be exerted in the numerous public and private elementary schools (taught by whites and educated Indians) is undoubtedly Protestant. According to the agent's statement, the schools managed by religious societies, either as pay-schools or under contract with the "nations," are generally the most successful. However this may be, our own force on that large field dwindles into insignificance when compared with the strength of the sects.

Quite a number of tribes or divisions of tribes have no other form of religion presented to them than the various creeds of Protestantism. In some reservations the envoys of the sects labor side by side with our own missionaries. Besides the above-named denominations, we find the Episcopalians strongly represented, especially in Dakota; and elsewhere smaller numbers of Mennonites, Moravians, and Friends. The ministers and teachers, among whom there are not a few natives, are generally supported by associations, such as the Native Missionary Society, the American Missionary Association, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the Presbyterian Women's Board of Foreign Missions, the Ladies' Home Missionary Society.

Not a few tribes, among whom we have no missions, are likewise unprovided with preachers or teachers sent directly and supported by the sects. Still, to all, or almost all of them, non-Catholic forms of belief and worship are offered, *together with the secular instruction provided for by the Government*. In very many cases the agents select the teachers—frequently members of their own household—with a view to win over the Indian youth to their own sect, or, at least, to imbue them with what they term "non-sectarian Christianity." Nor are the adults left unsolicited. They are invited to the religious exercises held by government *employés* in their residences, or in school-houses. And *semper aliquid hæret*.

If we add to this the bias given, by Protestant teachers, to the pupils in the governmental "training schools," the religious training of the children confided by the Government to various denominational institutions on reservations and "in states," and the influence which those educated youths will one day exert on their companions and families, the immense advantage will become patent which Protestantism, at the present day, has over the Church in giving direction to the religious thought of our still unconverted Indian brethren. And whatever may be the practical result—as to the forming of sincere convictions and Christian morals—of so much direct and indirect proselytizing, one thing is

certain: in the medley of truth and error, of vague, confused and diluted religious ideas, thus distilled into the Indian mind, the fundamental trait of Protestantism—denial of the one divinely instituted authority—will nowhere be wanting.

Shall we, then, censure the Administration for thus employing funds belonging to the tribes, and, to some extent, drawing upon the public treasury for the promotion of sectarian interests? We must distinguish. There is ample cause for complaint as regards the action of subaltern officers in the Indian Department. Thus, the expulsion of a Catholic missionary from a reservation because, in the race with his Episcopalian rival, he had "the inside track," the forcing of proselytizing teachers on Catholic tribes, and similar proceedings, are, to put it mildly, a disingenuous use of power, and will hardly be approved of by any fair-minded American.¹ But it

¹ The pretended offence of the missionary in question was that he had used his influence with the Indians to prevent them sending children to the Indian industrial schools—that is, the so-called Training Schools in the States, from which they may be expected to return more or less Protestantized.

"Regular moral and religious instruction is given daily. A part of one evening in the week is devoted to Bible study in each section, under the teacher in charge." . . . The different ministers of Carlisle have officiated for us, each one in turn taking six or seven consecutive Sundays, and giving a regular afternoon service, which was attended by all the students."

This extract from the report of the *Carlisle Indian Industrial School* speaks for itself. If the statement of an agent may be believed, children are occasionally kidnapped for those institutions. From the fact that a number of children had to be sent back to their parents, *by order of the Indian Office*, the accusation gains a color of truth.

The Superintendent of Indian Schools himself is compelled to make the following declaration.

"The method of obtaining pupils for the several training schools should be changed. Each of these schools, just before the commencement of the school year, sends its representative to the several agencies from which it expects to obtain Indian children to consent to go to the school he represents. The consequence is that promises are made to Indian children and their parents that are afterwards broken. Another bad result of this competitive canvassing for pupils for the training schools is seen in the bad physical and bad moral condition of some of the pupils thus obtained."

Evidently, "there is money" in educating Indians. And for discouraging parents from sending children to such institutions a priest is expelled from a reservation and "from the Indian country," by order of the honorable Secretary of the Interior!

Hear what an honest superintendent writes of the *Chilocco Industrial School*:

"Indians come and go at pleasure and do as they please while here. Cattlemen locate their herds on the school farm, come and go through the fences at pleasure, and defy any one who attempts to interfere. A race-course has been laid out on the school farm and horse-racing and whiskey-selling have been added to the list. It is safe to say that more drunken Indians may be seen at this school than at any agency in the Territory."

The number of teachers and other employees at that institution (including 12 "Cadet Sergeants") was *eighty-five* last year. It opened, in 1884, with 186 pupils—boys and girls; the number of pupils in 1885 is not reported. The care of 400 cattle consumed a great part of the boys' time.

The *Haskell Institute*, another training school, was built on land donated for the purpose to the Government by citizens of Lawrence, Kansas. It was visited by sick-

is of questionable propriety to find fault with the Administration for aiding private enterprise, promotive of the *civilization* of its ward, though the interests of *religious* parties may *indirectly* be promoted by such assistance. We may deeply regret, for the sake of our poor red brethren, that any number of them should be given the shadow for the substance, and that, together with the knowledge of their Creator and their duties towards Him, they should imbibe the subtle poison which slowly, but surely, corrodes both faith and charity. But we cannot consistently remonstrate against a measure of which we avail ourselves to the full extent of our ability. Our own day and boarding schools on the reservations, and such educational establishments "in the States" as are ready to receive Indian pupils, are, on the whole, placed on the same footing with those of the sects. In many of our missions, the teaching Sisters and Brothers are salaried out of funds due the tribes by treaty; and the Indian boarders in most of our institutions are either drawing the equivalent of their "rations" in money, or are otherwise sustained by contract. Nothing, then, remains for us to do in that contest—that dread competition for souls—but to multiply or enlarge our educational establishments on reservations and in Indian neighborhoods, to receive Indian pupils in our religious institutions throughout the country, and then apply for our quota of the Indian funds.¹

ness and death, in the first year of its existence; of 280 pupils, ten (between 15 and 23 years of age) died of pneumonia and congestion of heart and lungs. The anxiety for securing pupils had been so great that the house was occupied before the walls were dry and the heating apparatus in working order.

Truly, "there is a war going on for the Indians," as one of the Dakota pupils of *Hampton Institute* was made to say in her commencement speech last year.

¹ On this thorny question, the Indian School Superintendent thus expresses himself in his Report to the Department of the Interior, in 1885.

"All persons who know what has been done by Christian effort in Indian educational work, must heartily agree in saying that this effort should not be permitted to relax by reason of a failure of the government to encourage religious organizations that wish to send their schoolmasters among Indians. But the desire of the government to induce religious and philanthropic organizations not to relax their efforts for the benefit of the Indian should not lead it into the mistake of permitting any sect or educational society to use the friendship of the government in its own interest—to use the government in any effort to proselytize or fill its own purse.

"Therefore, the government should enter into no entangling alliance with any religious denomination or educational society. It should not permit any religious society to make its proselyters or its missionaries, as such, teachers of government schools. In other words, it should not permit any teacher to be appointed and paid by the government as a Presbyterian or Catholic or Episcopalian or Baptist government school teacher, and it should not, in its liberality, say to either the Catholic or Presbyterian or Baptist or Episcopalian Church: 'Here are school-buildings, which have been erected by the use of an appropriation made by Congress for the purpose of establishing a government school for Indians. You may take them free of rent and supply the school with teachers who are of your church, and make it an Indian school of your denomination, and the government will pay you so much per capita per annum for every In-

The assignment of the Indian Agencies to the several religious denominations—a measure as unpractical as it was unjust—has, under our last Administration, been happily dropped. If not yet absolutely free to plant the cross wherever we choose on the reservations and in Indian territory, we have before us a wide field for the display of missionary zeal and enterprise,—wider, in fact, than we may hope to supply for many years to come. In most of our existing missions there is room for expansion. Tribes, once partly or wholly Catholic—and still so, nominally at least,—are destitute of residing missionaries, and but rarely visited. A number of agencies among pagan tribes, that once were offered to Protestant denominations, have been left uncared for by the respective sects; and we are now welcome, nay, solicited, to enter upon the field.¹ How long we are to enjoy this privilege, is another question.

dian child you may induce or the government may compel to attend the school.' If the government were to give away to one church one of its school-buildings on such terms, it would be compelled, if its acts were controlled by logic, to give another building to another church, until it would have none under its own control, and there would be inaugurated, under the supervision of the government, a wrangle of the sects over the appropriations on the one hand, and over the souls of the Indians on the other. The government should control, by its own appointees, all schools which occupy buildings erected with funds appropriated for school-building purposes. While doing this, the government should be liberal in making contracts with religious denominations to teach Indian children in schools established by those denominations. It should throw open the door and say to all denominations: 'There should be no monopoly in good works. Enter all of you and do whatever your hands may find of good work to do, and in your efforts the government will give to you encouragement out of its liberal purse.' In other words, the government, without partiality, should encourage all the churches to work in this broad field of philanthropic endeavor, but in its management of government schools it should be in no degree under sectarian control."

In 1885, there existed contracts between the government and the President of our Indian Bureau, according to which the former was to pay from \$100 to \$120 per annum for as many Indian pupils—not exceeding the number of about 2000—as there would be boarded and instructed in 21 different Catholic institutions. This is far in excess of what non-Catholic parties obtained, and—probably—asked for; and well may they be satisfied with what is done, indirectly, for the furtherance of their cause, in about 130 government schools, with more than 1100 teachers and employees. The number of *Government schools under Catholic superintendence* is seven, with about fifty teachers.

¹ The following quotations from the reports of agents are here given for what they may be worth. They certainly contain food for reflection.

Round Valley Agency, Cal.

"No missionary has been sent to this agency for several years past. I have applied to several church organizations for a missionary, but up to this time none has been sent. . . . A regular Sabbath school has been maintained during the year with a very large attendance." (This agency was formerly assigned to the Methodists.)

Tula River Agency, Cal.

"No missionary work has ever been done for the Indians, only by their agents and employees, except an occasional visit of a Catholic priest. They have, however, been

The current of feeling in high and influential circles, it would seem, is rather against us. It is difficult, at least, otherwise to explain the singular mistake lately made by the Administration—the publication of a document, printed by order of Congress, at the expense of the United States Treasury, and containing the reports of various Protestant societies engaged in the Indian missions, together with speeches delivered at a conference of the “friends of Indian civilization,” in one of which the following passage—referring to the Presbyterian mission among the Pueblos—occurs:

“You all understand how difficult our work has been there—the communities being generally Catholic and under the influence of the priests. In spite of the Catholic priests, and what is a great deal worse, the Mormon priests, we have made our way, because the people thought we spoke better English.”¹

under Catholic influence ever since coming in contact with the Mexican population.” (Formerly assigned to the Methodists.)

Mescalero and Jicarilla Apache Agency, N. Mexico.

“Father Garnier, curé of Lincoln, occasionally passes here. He is a very pious and worthy man, but his parish is so large that he has no time to devote to work here.” (The number of Indians belonging to that agency is 1383. They were once given to the Presbyterians.)

Ouray Agency, Utah.

“There has been no missionary work done among these Indians since the establishment of the agency, excepting by the Mormons. . . . This agency is under the control of the Unitarian religious society, who have never done any work among the Indians owing to the lack of accommodations for a missionary.” (1252 Indians.)

Crow Agency, Montana.

“During the four years I have been in charge of this agency no missionary work has been done on this reservation.” (There are 3973 Crows and Cheyennes on the reservation. They have lately been visited by a Jesuit Father. The agency was once assigned to the Methodists.)

Quinault Agency, Wash.

“We have no missionary here, nor none to visit occasionally. The distance and the difficulty in reaching the agency are too great to expect it. What we do is to give a good moral tone to our system, to have sabbath service, to dress our scholars in their best on the Lord’s day, to have some little luxury prepared for them, to hold a singing service, and help them by our demeanor and advice.” (This agency, too, was once given to the Methodists.)

Colorado River Agency, Arizona (1884).

“The Sabbath day is spent by the opening of Sabbath school in the morning with regular exercises, in which all the teachers engage very earnestly. In the afternoon there is prayer meeting and pleasant gospel teaching, singing, etc. In the evening there is a short lecture or talk, bible reading, and singing exercises. There is a splendid field here for missionary work, and it is to be hoped some one will come and enter the good work at an early day.” (1012 Indians.)

¹ In some newspaper articles under the heading, “Has Cleveland found his Burghard?” the above passage (in the speech of the Rev. Dr. Kendall) is commented on in this wise:

“From this we would infer that the board and the evangelical agencies by which it

The political party opposed to the present Administration has quickly perceived and adroitly made use of that blunder. As to us, the most practical protest—the only one worthy of true Catholic mettle—against such mistaken policy will be a hearty, generous, and universal endorsement of our beloved prelates' late enactments for the support of the Indian missions. The opportunity for joining in this protest will be given to all, not excluding the most humble members of the mystic body of Christ, when, on the next first Sunday of Lent, the plate will be passed around in our churches.

is working, and the President who so warmly approves their methods, all regard Mormonism, Catholicism and Paganism as nearly equal evils from which the Indian must be converted."

This is rather disingenuous. The President, it is true, highly complimented the efforts of the "Friends of Indian civilization" (a committee of whom waited on him), and remarked that he had "learned to acknowledge, and more so every day, the benefit which this government has received and the obligation which it owes to Christian and secular teaching." But that interview took place *previously* to the meeting at which Dr. Kendall delivered his remarkable speech, and it is more than doubtful that the committee in question submitted their anti-Catholic plan of campaign for the President's approval.

The document referred to in our text is the "Report of the Board of Indian Commissioners for 1885," and must not be confounded with the "Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs," from which the extracts in our notes are taken. It contains accounts of the work of the Indian missions of the Baptists, the Congregationalists, the Episcopalians, the Friends, the Methodists, and the Presbyterians, but ignores the labors of Catholic missionaries.

The following extracts from the reports of Pueblo agents will be read with interest, in this connection.

"I reckon there are, more or less, fifteen hundred boys and girls in the nineteen Pueblos, who attend no school, but are growing in idleness, in indolence, in superstition. . . . This gloomy and truly sad picture, but true, has a way of being avoided by declaring by law that the education of the Indian youth is *obligatory* for every one of them between the ages of eight and eighteen years, under correctional pain. . . . Pedro Sanchez, Ind. Ag."

The successor of Mr. Pedro Sanchez happily takes a different view of the matter. He writes:

"I am sorry to say that the day-schools in this agency have not done very well, partly due to the teachers themselves and partly to the parents of the children. The teachers only taught school two hours in the morning and none in the afternoon, and they have paid more attention to missionary work than to teach the Indians the rudiments of learning. The parents of the children told me, in all the pueblos where there are schools, that they, being Catholics, did not like and would not send their children to Protestant schools, and I did not see a single instance where the schools are, where a boy could read and write. I strongly recommend these day schools in the pueblos, but on a different plan from what they have been heretofore. The teachers should be men that may know English and Spanish thoroughly, because the latter is the general language of all the Pueblo Indians, and of the religious denomination the Indians may want, that is, Catholics, because the Indians have told me plainly they will not send their children to Protestant schools, as the daily attendance of the children will prove. . . . Dolores Romero, Ind. Ag."

The average attendance in six day schools was, respectively, 20, 12, 10, 7, 7, 6. Six teachers and two assistants were paid for their labors (as above)—one, \$900, five each \$720, one \$480, and one \$360, per annum. The first Catholic Pueblo school was to be opened this month (September, 1885). May others soon follow!

THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM AND PROTESTANTISM.

THE public school question has assumed a new phase. New parties have entered the field of controversy, while one of the old ones has retired. The new parties to which we refer are Protestants, who have taken opposite sides, while the party that has retired from the field of strife is the great body of Catholics in the United States.

We do not mean to imply that Catholics have changed their convictions respecting the public school system, its unfairness and defectiveness, and its pernicious influences. On the contrary, their convictions on all these points have become deeper and stronger. But they have ceased in great degree from arguing the question with the advocates and defenders of the system. There is a time to speak and a time to be silent. As long as there was any probability that Catholics could turn non-Catholic public opinion in a right direction by protest and argument, they protested and argued. But protest and argument have not availed, and the only course the Catholics of the United States can consistently adopt is to withdraw their children from the public schools, and establish special Catholic schools for their education.

Meanwhile, the public school system has gone on extending itself, and completing itself after its own fundamental ideas and principles. It has taken possession of the whole field of non-Catholic education excepting collegiate, technical, and professional education; and even the non-Catholic colleges and other like institutions that have not been absorbed or destroyed by the public school system, have adopted, or are rapidly adopting its principle of ignoring religion.

While the public school system has thus had full opportunity to extend and develop itself and to exert its legitimate but pernicious influence upon non-Catholics, the Catholic population of our country are being gradually, and, of late years, with increasing rapidity, brought under the influences of a Catholic school system. Already more than half a million of children are being educated in Catholic parochial schools, and the number of these schools is not only increasing, but they are also growing as regards comprehensiveness of scope and thoroughness of instruction and discipline. The Church in the United States has committed itself to the work of establishing a general and complete system of parochial school education, and, with a few exceptions here and there, bishops, priests and laity

are heartily and vigorously engaged in carrying on this good and all-important work.

To this there are some exceptions. There are those who continue lukewarm and dilatory as regards this subject. There are parishes abundantly able to establish parochial schools that are still destitute of them, and other parishes which could have excellently equipped and organized parochial schools, but which have schools that, in the shabbiness and slovenliness of their arrangements and the insufficiency and inefficiency of their instruction and discipline, are a shame and a disgrace to those parishes. A like remark is, perhaps, applicable to a few populous dioceses which are financially able to engage vigorously in the work of establishing a parochial school system, but which have not as yet undertaken it. But these are exceptions. The time seems near at hand when Catholic schools for Catholic children will be established throughout our country, and Catholic children will be almost entirely withdrawn from the public schools.

All this is a sore disappointment to Protestants who expected and hoped that the public school system could be so managed that it would be an efficient instrumentality for Protestantizing Catholic children. They hoped and expected that Catholic children would largely adopt the Protestant idea of private judgment, and recruit the membership of Protestant "churches." This expectation has utterly failed of realization. The public schools do tend to de-Catholicize the Catholic children who continue to attend them. Their influence does certainly weaken the faith and the spirit of obedience to ecclesiastical authority and the precepts of the Church. But this de-Catholicizing process does not furnish recruits to the Protestant sects. The Catholic pupils of the public schools who are thus de-Catholicized, do not generally become Protestants; they become indifferentists, practical rationalists and infidels. Protestants, therefore, gain no accession of strength from this tendency of the public school system.

And while the public school system has disappointed Protestants as regards Catholic children, it has also disappointed them as regards its effects upon Protestant children. Instead of serving as a help to the Protestant sects, and training up the children of Protestants to become active members of those sects, as many Protestant ministers contended they would, they tend to weaken the respect of those children for the religious opinions and practices of their parents, and to inoculate them with rationalistic and materialistic ideas.

This tendency of the public school system, and its hostile influences as regards what is commonly called "Evangelical" or "Orthodox" Protestantism, have become so obvious that a number of

more discerning and thoughtful Protestants acknowledge it, and are searching for a remedy. Many of these, there is reason to think, believe in their hearts that the Catholic position with regard to the present public school system is the right one. But they despair of convincing the Protestant sects of the fact, or rather they despair of inducing them to act energetically and practically upon it. They see that they are hopelessly divided as respects religious belief and practice, and they think that this division among themselves creates an insuperable obstacle to their uniting in any common effort to introduce positive religious instruction into the public schools. Moreover, they know that it would be futile to propose to the members of their respective sects to adopt the Catholic method of practically solving the question, by each "Orthodox" Protestant sect establishing schools for the children of its own members, maintained by voluntary individual contributions. For they are fully aware that the members of those sects are lacking in the zeal and Christian generosity and the sense of Christian obligation necessary to induce them to consent to bear the burden such an arrangement would involve.

As regards this last mentioned point, they are undoubtedly correct. Their religion is entirely lacking in the elements which induce and enable Catholics to make the sacrifices which they constantly make, and feel that they must cheerfully make for the sake of religion; among which is that of sustaining Catholic schools. But, as regards the point first mentioned, they are partly right and partly wrong.

The divided, self-antagonistic condition of "Orthodox" Protestants is unquestionably a difficulty in the way of their finding a common ground on which to unite in contending for the introduction of religious education into the public schools. Yet it is not an insurmountable obstacle.

In fact, the real difficulty, so far as it is a difficulty, consists not so much in the fact of the existing differences and divisions of the "Orthodox" Protestant sects, as in that of their mutual jealousies, and also in the general indifference and lukewarmness of Protestant parents as to the religious education of their children.

Protestant sects could unite, without any serious difficulty, upon a plan or method of introducing religious instruction into the public school system, were they able to forego or subordinate their mutual jealousies of each other, and their common jealousy of the Catholic Church.

That this is possible is proved by the fact that, in other countries than the United States, the difficulty has been more or less successfully surmounted by different methods, and with, at least, approximate justice to the civil and religious rights of the mem-

bers of all religious denominations, and an approximately equal distribution both of the burdens and the benefits of the educational systems maintained in those countries.

The methods are different in different countries, but they all have a common aim and object, viz., the maintaining of such a system of public education as will enable parents of different religious beliefs to avail themselves of the system, without violation of their rights of conscience; or, in other words, to have their children, under the public school system, trained up and instructed in their respective religious beliefs, as well as in merely secular knowledge.

This principle, in fact, is acknowledged and in more or less successful practical operation in every country in Europe, excepting Russia, France and Italy. In semi-barbarous Russia there is no system of common school education, and the State-supported technical schools and colleges and universities are simply nests for hatching out infidels of the most pronounced atheistic type. In France, the very name of God has been banished from the public schools and excluded from the text-books; and, since reference to His divine and incommunicable attributes can *not* be excluded from human thought, these have been *heathenized*, by employing, wherever reference to them is necessary, the names of the false gods of Roman and Grecian mythology, Jupiter, Jove, Minerva, Mars, Mercury, Apollo, Venus! In Italy, the whole influence and action of its government is openly and avowedly against all religious education, and in favor of a purely materialistic and irreligious education.

Is it not a shame and a disgrace to the people of the United States, and especially to the great majority of the Protestants of the United States, that, professing, as they do, to be firm believers in Christianity and ardent supporters of "a pure Gospel," which they desire shall be propagated over all the earth, they yet sustain and defend a system of education which undermines, in the hearts of their children, their own declared belief; which refuses to adopt any of the plans or methods of European nations that recognize the necessity of religious education, and which, in principle, follows the example and adopts the ideas (though, as yet, it dare not openly carry them out to their full extent) of the infidel governments of France and Italy!

We have said that there are different plans and methods by which Protestants, thrusting into the background their mutual jealousies, may obtain the benefits of a religious education of their children by a modification of the present public school system, without any serious advantage or disadvantage to any Protestant sect. With deliberate intention, we exclude all reference to Cath-

olics from this part of our discussion. For, it is a fixed conclusion, a matter now of absolute certainty, that, whether the public school system shall eventually be so modified, or not, as to permit the introduction of positive, distinctive, denominational religious instruction, Catholics and the Catholic Church in this country will see to it that the children of Catholic parents shall receive Catholic religious instruction and training.

Moreover, not only Catholics knew from the first, but Protestants have learned from the actual practical operation of the present public school system, that it is utterly vain for them to expect (as unquestionably many of them did expect) to obtain recruits to the membership of their different sects from the Catholic children who attend the public schools. It is an undeniable and most deeply to be deplored fact that many of these children do fall away from belief in the Catholic religion, and still more of them from practising it and attending to their religious duties. But these apostates from the faith or from the practice of the Catholic religion do not become, except in a very few and rare instances, members of any "Evangelical" or "Orthodox" Protestant sect. The vast majority of them become entirely neglectful of and indifferent to religious obligations, or practical infidels.

Of different methods or plans for introducing and maintaining distinctive denominational instruction in public schools, without favoring any religious denomination to the disadvantage of others, we will refer to only two.

One of these methods is, that each religious denomination shall establish its own denominational schools with such arrangements as the educational wants of the children of each denomination require. Then, in order to distribute the moneys arising from public school taxation proportionately and fairly between each denomination (and so, too, as regards undenominational and entirely secular schools), each taxpayer is allowed to designate, according to his individual preferences, what schools, whether denominational or undenominational, the school-tax he pays shall go to support. In this way the schools of each denomination and those of no religious denomination form parts of the public school system and stand on a basis of perfect equality in the eye of the law.

A modification of this plan is to allow each taxpayer personally to pay over the amount of his school-tax directly to the support of such denominational or undenominational schools as he may prefer. On payment of his school-tax in this way, he receives a written voucher, which, when exhibited to the public school treasurer or collector, is accepted as proof that he has paid his school-tax.

This plan, under either form, is theoretically fair and just. But

in its practical administration, sundry difficulties would arise. We, consequently, dismiss it without further remark.

The other plan is one that is not only theoretically fair and just, but has the merit of having been adopted, and found, on actual trial, to work successfully in a number of European countries and in Canada. In each of these countries, it has been modified, as regards details, to suit the different circumstances and educational wants of the people. But the essential, fundamental idea is preserved.

The plan is this: All public school taxes are paid into a common public school fund. From this fund equal *pro rata* allotments are made to all public schools, according to the respective number of pupils who regularly attend them, and attain to a certain specified standard of scholarship in their respective grades and studies.

These allotments are made irrespective of the denominational or undenominational character of the schools, whether they are Catholic, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, Lutheran, or entirely undenominational and purely secular.

Official examiners or inspectors are appointed, who examine all candidates for the position of teachers in these schools, without respect to their religious tenets. The examinations refer to purely secular branches of knowledge, and certificates of competency are given or withheld, according to the actual results of those examinations. No one is permitted to teach in these public schools without a certificate of competency from the official examiners.

Under this plan, when fairly and impartially carried out, full justice is done to the rights and preferences of parents of different religious beliefs and to those who have no religious belief. Catholics can send their children to Catholic schools, Protestants can send theirs to their several sectarian schools, and persons, who prefer undenominational and entirely secular schools, can send their children to such schools.

This plan has been adopted in other countries and under different modifications, as we have already said, and gives general satisfaction. It aims to do equal justice to Catholics, to members of the Established Church, to non-conformists of different sects, and to those who are indifferentists or pure secularists as regards religious belief.

The only difficulty that has arisen in England respecting it is, that the purely secular element preponderates in the administration of the system, and exercises favoritism towards the non-denominational schools and against those which are denominational, and particularly against Catholic schools.

Still, the system has such obvious advantages over an entirely undenominational system, from which distinctive religious instruc-

tion is excluded, that Catholics, Anglicans and the different non-conformist Protestant bodies of England unite in upholding it, and in opposing the introduction of an undenominational and purely secular system.

In Belgium, a system exists, based on the same general idea, by which Catholic and Protestant, and purely secular schools are aided or supported by appropriations from the public school fund, though, strictly speaking, the number of Protestants in Belgium is small, the people being almost entirely divided between the Catholics and the Secularists.

In the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the majority of the people are Catholics, but the preferences of Protestants are carefully respected, and provision is made in the administration of the public school system for appropriations, without distinction, from the school funds to Protestant schools in which Protestant religious instruction is imparted, as well as for schools in which the Catholic Religion is taught, along with secular branches of knowledge.

In the Dominion of Canada a like system prevails, and Protestant and Catholic schools, and so, too, undenominational or purely secular schools, are aided or supported by public school funds, without regard to their religious or non-religious status.

In these, and in other countries which have adopted the system we are describing, there are differences of administrative details and of the manner in which the public school funds are raised and distributed. But these differences do not affect the general principle of impartiality and non-interference, on the part of the State and its officials, with the religious preferences and rights of parents; and the appropriations from the State public school funds to Catholic schools, to Protestant denominational schools, and to undenominational schools, are made on a fair and equitable basis.

In all these countries the government officials have no power to interfere with the internal managements of the schools. They visit and inspect them from time to time, and examine the pupils periodically, or are present at their examination, and note the results. Thus the comparative efficiency of the different schools is ascertained, and they are all kept up to the government standard of thoroughness in instruction and training, under the penalty, in case of failure, of not receiving the government allotment. Beyond this, there is usually no interference on the part of government officials.

In England the results of these periodical examinations are carefully tabulated and published. They furnish a fair basis for comparisons between the different schools, and these comparisons show conclusively that, as regards efficiency in promoting intellectual development and imparting secular knowledge, the denomi-

national schools keep fully abreast, and are frequently in advance of the undenominational or purely secular schools. As regards their influence upon the moral and religious habits and characters of the pupils, they are infinitely superior.

There is no real obstacle to the introduction of a like system into the United States, except that which unreasoning prejudice creates. In the present state of public opinion, the vast majority of Protestants join with Indifferentists and Secularists in opposing it. But this opposition, so far as Protestants are concerned, as we will show before we close, is really opposition to their own denominational interests. It is a practical surrender by them of the advantages they might derive from a public school system such as we have broadly sketched. It is a handing over of the present public school system to the promotion of Rationalism and mere Secularism.

Protestants usually assert that the change we are advocating is impracticable, though many of them declare that they would heartily favor it, were it possible to adopt it.

But the alleged impracticability is purely imaginary. That it has no foundation in fact is proved by the actual successful workings of the system under different modifications in the countries we have mentioned.

Were the system adopted in this country, there would not be any real difficulty in Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists and other Protestant sects having each its own distinctive denominational schools; and so, also, Catholics; and so, also, on the other hand, those who would prefer entirely undenominational or purely secular schools, each receiving from the public school fund *pro rata* allotments, according to the respective number of pupils that, on periodical examinations, were found to have attained an average standard of scholarship in certain specified studies.

The only possible actual difficulty in carrying out such an arrangement that we have ever heard mentioned, is that, in some regions of our country, the number of members of one or another religious denomination is so small that the allotments that would be made to a school for the children of that denomination in such a locality would be insufficient to sustain a school.

Consequently, it is objected that, under such a public school system as we have described, all the denominations of numerous membership could have denominational schools, but those which, in particular localities, had but few members and few children, could not receive enough money from the public school fund to sustain denominational schools for them.

The objection has a basis in actually existing facts. There are

localities in our country where, for example, it would be difficult or impossible to find Hebrew, or Catholic, or Episcopalian children enough to constitute even a small school. So, doubtless, there are other districts where it would be difficult to find a sufficient number of children, of Baptist, or Methodist, or Lutheran parents.

But this fact, after all, constitutes no real objection to the introduction of the system. For, in such cases, the denomination, which has so few members, and so widely scattered, would have to submit to the disadvantage, just as in such cases they now have to do without denominational churches and ministers, and without regular denominational worship of their own distinctive type.

Then, too, the proportionate number of members of each denomination that, under this system, could not have the advantage of denominational schools, would be very small as compared with the number that could. Moreover, these exceptional instances of disadvantage would be distributed among the different denominations, with approximate equality. And whatever small inequality would still be found to exist, would fall most heavily upon the Hebrews and the Catholics. The former congregate most numerous in our large towns and cities, and in those places they would receive their full proportion of the public school fund. Still, their relation to the public school fund would be infinitely better than it is now. For, so far as distinctive religious education in the Hebrew belief is concerned, their children are entirely shut out from all provision for them in our present public school system.

The Catholics, in like manner, would be at a disadvantage, particularly in our southern and western States and Territories, and also in very many country districts even in New England and the Atlantic "Middle" States. Still, in comparison with their present relation to the public school fund, approximate justice would be done them, whereas now they receive none.

There is another consideration which would reduce to a minimum the practical operation of the fact which forms the basis of the objection we have been considering, so far as Protestants are concerned. It is that, in sparsely settled districts where there may be many Protestant denominations, each or most of them having but few members, all, or nearly all, the "Evangelical" or "Orthodox" Protestant sects could unite in having religious instruction in a Union Protestant public school. For they contend that their doctrinal differences are non-essential.

They annually send delegates from their "synods" and "assemblies" and "conventions" to declare to each other their mutual fraternal interest and affection. They constantly interchange pulpits and fraternize on almost every public occasion. They form and maintain "Evangelical Alliances," in which they declare and pro-

claim, that, though they keep up different religious organizations, they are one in their essential belief and practice. They unite in maintaining their "Young Men's Christian Associations," in having weekly or monthly "Ministerial Conferences." Still more, as regards their Sunday Schools, they maintain a "Sunday School Union." This institution furnishes the religious literature which is distributed to four-fifths or five-sixths, at least, of the children who attend Protestant Sunday Schools in the United States, without regard to their sectarian differences. This Union supplies their hymn-books, their question-books, and other books for religious exercises and instruction.

Now, this being the case, the question at once arises, and we put it to Protestants to answer, "Why, in districts where each Protestant sect has only a few members, and only a few children to educate, can they not thus combine in a common '*union*' public school for the education of their children?" They have thus combined, they do thus combine on *Sundays*. Why can they not thus combine on week days?

Were they willing to do this, it would remove all difficulty in their case of securing the amplest provision from the public school fund for the moral and religious, as well as the intellectual instruction of their children. There is hardly a hamlet or township throughout our whole country in which Protestants could not have a "Union" Protestant school, while, in all our large towns and cities, and throughout the densely populated parts of the country, they could have separate Protestant denominational schools.

In many country districts Catholics, owing to their fewness, could not have Catholic schools, and it would be upon them, and not upon Protestants, that these exceptional inequalities in the practical working of the system would chiefly fall. Yet, still the disadvantage at which they would be placed in certain localities would be small compared with that which, under the present school system, they must submit to.

There remains but one other objection that needs answering. It is that a public school system, such as we have referred to, would be more expensive than the present one.

Were this objection founded on fact, the moral advantages resulting from the introduction of the system we mention would far outweigh any considerations of increased pecuniary outlay. They would be paid back, too, ten times over, in the saving of the enormous present public expenditure for the prevention, repression and punishment of crime. That vice and crimes are increasing in the United States with far greater rapidity than our increase in population, is an indisputable fact; that the public schools exert no appreciable influence against this increase, is also indisputable.

When they were first projected, and for some years after they were generally introduced, their advocates insisted that they would promote virtue and morality, as well as intellectual development.

There were, however, among the "Evangelical" or "Orthodox" Protestants, a very large number of hard-headed folks who believed otherwise, particularly among the Germans of the interior counties of Pennsylvania. They justified their opposition to un-denominational public schools by the homely and pithy maxim, that "the more fully you instruct children in secular knowledge, unaccompanied with religious training, the greater rascals you will make them." Their opposition was overcome; but that their declaration has a foundation in fact, experience has fully proved.

The failure of the public schools to train their pupils in good morals and virtuous habits, along with secular instruction, is so evident that, contrary to the very arguments which were used when the public schools were first projected and introduced, their defenders now assert that it is no part of the purpose and object of public schools to teach morality or train their pupils in virtuous habits; that their purpose includes nothing more than that of imparting secular knowledge and promoting intellectual development.

This is a virtual acknowledgment of the entire failure of the present public school system to do the work it was originally instituted to do. The State taxes its citizens for the support of public schools, in order that, through them, the rising generation may be trained up, not simply to be intellectually smart and keen and sharp, but that they may become *good citizens*, law-abiding, moral, virtuous members of society, and thus may strengthen the State and add to public prosperity and welfare.

We repeat, therefore, that, in acknowledging that the public schools, on their present basis, cannot, efficiently, teach morality and train their pupils to virtuous habits, the supporters and defenders of the present system virtually confess that it is a failure, as regards its original purpose—the training up of good, virtuous citizens.

Moreover, this acknowledgment is a wholesale condemnation of the public schools. It is a virtual denial, too, of the right of the State to tax its citizens, and appropriate even a single dollar to support such a system.

The sole, the only plea of right the State can put forward for sustaining any public school system of education, is that that system trains up *better*, not "smarter" citizens; that it makes the children more *virtuous*, as well as more *intelligent*. If the system fails in accomplishing this, it fails entirely, as regards its proper and legitimate purpose.

And, if it fails in *this*, as we contend the present public school system has notoriously and confessedly failed, then the tens of millions and hundreds of millions of dollars that, throughout our States and Territories, are annually expended in supporting our present ineffective, one-sided, godless system of public schools, is worse than wasted. We go further even than this, and assert that the present school system is simply a machine for practically de-Christianizing and un-Christianizing the children, and for training up a generation of intellectually smart, quick, keen, law-evading, and law dis-obeying citizens.

This is a sufficient answer to the assertion that a denominational school system would involve greater expense. It would not, at all events, be an utter failure, as regards its moral results, as the present school system confessedly is.

The money that would be expended upon it, be the amount greater or smaller than that which now is expended in supporting our present public school system, would not be expended for useless purposes, so far as the public welfare is concerned. It would not be expended in training children into men and women indifferent as to religious belief and obligations, practical infidels, regardless of law and of the obligations of divinely revealed religion. For, however widely we, as Catholics, may differ from, and oppose each and all of the Protestant sects, we freely and unhesitatingly acknowledge that the wide and irreconcilable differences of their doctrinal tenets do not reach to a denial of the divine origin of Christianity, nor to a denial of the fact of a divine revelation. And "each and all" Protestants who can and do train their children in this belief, do a better work, beyond all comparison, than citizens who give up their children to a system of instruction and training which tends, practically, to make them disbelievers in any divinely revealed religion, and which thus destroys, in their minds, every substantial basis of morality.

How much of all the vast waste of public money, under the present un-Christian, secular, materialistic, atheistic system of public instruction would be saved by the introduction of positive religious, denominational instruction and training, we leave to others to compute. Suffice it to say that there would be an immense saving in police expenses, in criminal court expenses, in prison expenses.

Thus far we have been arguing the question on the concession that the cost of the proposed denominational public school system would be greater than that of the present system of undenominational public schools. But, in fact, we deny the concession. Our actual contention is that the cost of the proposed system would be no greater, and perhaps less, than that of the present system, while

the moral results for the good order and welfare of society would be infinitely greater.

In the first place, the distribution of the public school fund would be taken almost entirely out of the sphere of partisan politics. The extent to which practical "jobbery" and favoritism on account of partisan preferences are practised, in connection with the administration of the present public school system, is known to be very great. Under the proposed system, it could scarcely exist.

In the second place, the public school fund would be more fairly and equally distributed, as between the wealthy and the poor. It was not originally intended that the public schools should be so graded up into high schools and technical colleges, and should include so extensive a course of accomplishments as to satisfy the wants of the wealthy few. The public schools were professedly designed to be "*common* schools," that is, schools whose arrangements and selection of studies should be sufficient for the common needs of the public as a whole, and should not go beyond them.

Yet, as they are now practically administered, the greater amount of the money raised from taxation for the support of the public school system, goes to sustain departments and arrangements, and to pay for instruction in special studies and accomplishments, of which only the wealthy few can avail themselves, while to the "masses," to the vast majority of the people, these expenditures are not of the slightest benefit. Not only, indeed, are they of no benefit to them, but they absorb an inordinate part of the public school fund. They constantly provide for the wealthy few the most efficient teachers the public schools are able to furnish, and the most complete educational apparatus that money can procure, while the children of the masses of the majority of the people of the United States must put up with the remnants; the crumbs that fall from the public school table, inferior school buildings, inferior school apparatus, inferior school-teachers.

Under a "denominational" school system these abuses, this gross injustice, would be measurably prevented, and the administration of the public school fund would be more strictly confined to the professed original purpose and object, the education of the children of the "masses," of the majority of the people, in rudimental, useful, practical, solid branches of knowledge.

Thirdly, under a "denominational" public school system there would be tens and hundreds of thousands of citizens, not only Catholic citizens, but also non-Catholic who could conscientiously avail themselves of it, but who, under the existing system, conscientiously refuse to send their children to the public schools. From considerations referring to the moral training of their children, they now

send them to private schools, or other educational institutions than those sustained by the public school funds, while at the same time they are compelled to pay their quota of public school taxes. From this double burden these citizens (forming, in the aggregate, a large part of the people of our country), would be relieved.

We have answered, we think, all the objections that, with any seeming right or reason, can be brought against a denominational school system.

We return, therefore, to the leading idea with which we started out. It is that "Evangelical" or "Orthodox" Protestants are simply "cutting their own throats," in supporting an undenominational or "unsectarian" public school system. Or, to change the figure of speech, they are strangling the "churches" of which they are respectively members, by the "undenominational" or unsectarian education of their children, under the present public school system.

Whether "Evangelical" or "Orthodox" Protestantism could or could not resist, for a century or two longer, the solvent of its own inherent self-contradictions, it must be perfectly obvious to all keenly observing and logically reasoning Protestants that it cannot resist the unmistakable tendency of the public school system to propagate mere rationalism, naturalism, and practical materialistic atheism. That is, Protestantism cannot resist this tendency unless Protestant parents withdraw their children from public undenominational schools, and establish Evangelical Orthodox Protestant schools.

But this Protestant parents will *not* do. They (or vast numbers of them) would be glad to have such schools and to send their children to them. But they will not consent to bear the double burden of paying school taxes under the existing system and also incurring the expense of separate distinctive denominational schools. They lack the necessary faith, the necessary confidence in the certainty and truth of their convictions, the necessary religious zeal and spirit of self-sacrifice.

As regards Catholics, the result is and will be different. Between them and the upholders of purely secular education, the issue has been definitely made, argued, and decided. The Catholic Church has declared, and the Catholics of the United States, as elsewhere, intelligently and conscientiously accept the declaration, that mere secular education is godless education, and that Catholic children shall not be subjected to its demoralizing influences. Already half a million of the children of Catholics have been withdrawn from the public schools and are being trained up as *Christians*—as CATHOLICS, in distinctive Catholic schools. Year by year, month by month, nay, day by day, the number of these

schools and of their pupils is increasing, and the time is not far distant when a Catholic church or parish that has not connected with it a Catholic school will be an exceptional instance.

The battle between secular schools and Catholic schools for Catholic children has been fought and won, and won in favor of the Catholic side of the contention. We do not deny that the victory bears heavily on Catholics as regards dollars and cents. They must pay their public school taxes and, at the same time, pay all the expenses of sustaining Catholic parochial schools and other Catholic educational institutions.

But the Catholics of the United States have counted the cost and are prepared to pay it. It is unjust that they should be thus doubly taxed and burdened. Yet they will submit to the injustice rather than have their children demoralized, de-Christianized, and practically infidelized. It is not the first, nor the second, nor the third instance of unfairness and injustice, that as law-obeying, peace-preserving citizens of the United States, Catholics have had to endure. As the ancient fish-wife, of Boston, when remonstrated with, by a spectator, for skinning live eels, replied, "It does not hurt them, they are used to it," so the Catholics of the United States are "used" to suffering injustice for the sake of religion and of their religious obligations.

But with Protestants the case is different. They will not pay public school taxes and at the same time incur the expense of supporting distinctive denominational schools. Yet without such denominational schools for the instruction and training of Protestant children, it is as certain as that day succeeds night, that each and all of the Protestant sects will lose their identity and their distinctive existence, and will dissolve down into mere undogmatic, undistinctive, vague, rationalistic naturalism.

Our conclusion is that in sustaining and defending of the present "undenominational" system of public school education, "Evangelical," orthodox Protestantism is simply working out its own destruction.

Scientific Chronicle.

RECENT EARTHQUAKES.

FEW of the many accounts of the late Earth movements in Charleston, South Carolina, and in the surrounding States are reliable, or such as to give us any data for a true scientific study of the phenomenon. As earthquakes have occurred only at very far off intervals in most of our States, no wonder that no provision has been made for their exact observation. In fact, even when foreseen, observations on the attendant phenomena are not easily made, as a recent experiment has made apparent. Last October, on the occasion of the blasting of Flood Rock, in Long Island Sound, preparations were made to study the propagation of the earth's wave resulting from that great explosion, which may be compared to a diminutive earthquake. The results, however, were by no means satisfactory. It was to be expected, then, that in the late unforeseen shock of August 31st there would be much uncertainty in determining the centre of oscillation of the earthquake waves and their rate of propagation. Speaking of the Flood Rock explosion in last January's *CHRONICLE*, we explained how the waves coming from an earth-jar are propagated. At the time, the ultimate causes of the disturbances being known, this was the only problem to be studied. In natural earthquakes the ultimate cause is the first subject of inquiry. As is well known, scientists admit that this cause is either a subterranean explosion, connected with volcanic action, or a sudden bodily movement of large areas of the earth's surface, due probably to the contraction of the inner mass. These movements, when made gradually, do not produce any noticeable disturbance, but if the earth's crust resists the contractions, and the force accumulates, the yielding finally takes place with great crushing and fissures. To these two causes, at different times and on different occasions, the production of earthquakes is attributed; and to the latter, in our opinion, the earthquake at Charleston is due. The first confirmation of this statement may be found in the fact that the shock coincided with a very high tide arising from the combined action of sun and moon on the day of the solar eclipse of August 29th. This tide must have produced a very high pressure all along the coast. Moreover, it is an accepted opinion in geology that there is a line of weakness in the earth's crust, starting from North Carolina and going somewhat in the direction of Toronto. It is not surprising, then, that a force accumulated near Charleston, perhaps for a long time, caused the recent disturbance. Another confirmation may be had from the chemical analysis of some specimens,—for which we are indebted to a friend—taken from the fissures near Charleston. They were found to consist mostly of silicates of sodium, potassium and aluminium, with traces of

iron oxide and calcium phosphate—in other words, of sand and mud ; giving, therefore, no sign of volcanic action. We found in them no sulphur, though according to some accounts the presence of sulphur in the air after the shock was perceptible. The same conclusion seems to be indicated by a singular feature connected with the earthquake. The artesian well which supplies the reservoir of Charleston, and which is said to have a depth of over 1500 feet, showed no change of flow or temperature.

The manner of propagation of these earth waves, however incomplete our knowledge of their causes may be, seems to be better known. They moved more rapidly in a direction almost north and south, or in the direction of the line of weakness, than from east to west. They were consequently elliptical with the major axis of the ellipse lying along the direction of the line of weakness. It was furthermore noticed that at different places the intensity of the tremor was different, and that it was wholly unperceived in places situated between districts very badly shaken. This apparent anomaly will find an easy explanation in the geological formation of such places. They are areas of solid formation isolated from others by soft areas incapable, on account of their want of elasticity, of conveying the earth waves. Another phenomenon generally attending earthquakes on the coast, but fortunately absent in this case, is the advance of great sea-waves. Their formation is very easily explained: when the shock comes, the ocean-bottom is lifted up or slips down, and a great mass of water is hurled one way or other with force enough to sweep every obstacle from its path. Its absence in the present instance is, we presume, due to the fact that the earth waves, starting inland, ran towards the ocean; hence if the water wave was formed it would have been noticed only at sea.

At the present date of writing (September 15th), no further scientific remarks on this subject seem to be called for; should some new facts throwing light on the nature of the phenomena be made known, we shall return to the subject. We will merely add that no scientific ground can be assigned for the prediction of another earthquake on September 29th. It is true that about that time the sun and moon will again be in conjunction, and Mars will be in the same portion of the heavens; but this does not prove anything in favor of such a prediction.

MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE.

ON the 18th of August the American Association for the Advancement of Science met at Buffalo, and continued in session until the 24th, inclusive. We shall give a brief account of the scientific part of the proceedings, after having made some remarks on the nature of the Association itself. The matter treated in the meetings will give us occasion to

touch on the scientific work that has been done during the last few months.

Nature of the Association.—Like the British Association for the Advancement of Science, after which the American is modelled in its general features, this Association proposes, “by periodical and migratory meetings, to promote intercourse between those who are cultivating science in different parts of America, to give a stronger and more general impulse and more systematic direction to scientific research, and to procure for the labors of scientific men increased facilities and a wider usefulness.”

The Association, besides a few Patrons,—at present there are only three,—who are classed as such when they give the sum of one thousand dollars or more, is composed of Members and Fellows. The former are elected by the standing committee upon the written recommendations of two members. From among these the same committee elect by ballot the Fellows, or such persons as are by profession engaged in science, or have by their labors aided in its advancement. The number of Fellows is necessarily more limited than that of Members; at present it is about six hundred, while the Members in July of this year numbered nearly two thousand.

The Association is divided into many small societies, or rather sections. Each Section is composed of Members who apply themselves to the same branch of scientific research. According to the present arrangement, the Sections embrace the following studies: Mathematics and Astronomy, Physics, Chemistry, Mechanical Science, Geology and Geography, Biology, Anthropology, Economic Science and Statistics. Each one of the Sections is presided over by a vice-president and has its own secretary, while the whole Association has a president, a general and assistant secretary, besides the permanent secretary, Professor F. W. Putnam, of Cambridge, Mass., and treasurer, W. Lilly, of Mauch Chunk, Pa. All these officers, except the last two, are elected every year by a standing committee comprising the past presidents and officers of both the preceding and actual meeting.

The Proceedings of each meeting are printed, but it is to be regretted that the distribution of these publications cannot be made earlier. Without them no one can have a thorough knowledge of what has been accomplished in a meeting, for it is not in the general sessions, but in those of the Sections, that the real scientific work is done, and these Sections choose different places for their meetings. Thirty-four volumes of records show how regularly the Association has met in past years, except those between 1861–65. The two most important meetings ever held were that at Boston in 1880, and the one at Philadelphia in 1884. The latter was of special interest, owing to the presence of many members of the British Association, which was convened at Montreal that year.

Meeting at Buffalo.—Buffalo is the only city which has been honored by the presence of the Association three times since 1848: the meetings having taken place there at intervals of ten years, in 1866, 1876 and this year. Notwithstanding the many attractions of this great city, its

easy means of access, the interest shown by the local committee and the prestige of its former successful gatherings, the number of members present did not go beyond one-fourth of the whole body. Those, however, who had the good fortune to be there say that the sessions were most enjoyable. About two hundred papers were read, and though they did not show great originality, and contained no important discoveries, nearly all of them were of sufficient interest to command the attendance of not only members of the Association, but of ladies and gentlemen living in Buffalo.

Address of Professor H. A. Newton.—On the morning of the 18th of August, in the first general session, some preliminary business was settled, and in the evening the real work was taken up. It was during the second general session of the day that Professor Newton, the retiring president, gave his address, which by competent men has been declared the most prominent feature of the Buffalo meeting.

Unlike many of his predecessors, and contrary to the custom followed by the presidents of the British Association, Professor Newton, instead of a general subject, took a special one, which has been, perhaps, the most important study of his life—Meteorites, Meteors and Shooting Stars. Were justice done it, we should give the entire paper, or at least a longer account than our space will allow. We shall attempt the following synopsis, which will enable the reader, we think, to form an idea of its merits.

Having stated the facts generally admitted by scientific men about those luminous phenomena, he proves that meteors cannot be produced otherwise than by solid bodies, which, in virtue of their own motion, enter our atmosphere and become luminous by their friction with the air. Contrary to the opinion of some scientists, he holds that the *shooting stars*, or meteors, which may be noticed any clear night, and the *star showers*, or luminous displays, which occur at certain times—one of them took place November 27th, 1885—are of the same origin, and that from either meteors or luminous displays come the meteorites we find on the earth's surface. From the study of many specimens, as also by theoretic deductions, he surmises that the average size of meteoric bodies is rather small; and hence he scouts the opinion of Meyer and others who believe that the preservation of the calorific energy of the sun may come from the fall of such bodies into its surface.

Passing to the origin of meteoric matter, Professor Newton holds that it cannot be due to the sun or the earth's volcanic eruptions, nor to the planets proper or the moon, and therefore concludes that it must be of cometary formation. Moreover, he assumes that comets themselves are condensed from nebulous matter, and this matter may come from the outer portions of the original solar nebula, or from nebula distinct from it.

Papers of the Sections.—We would go beyond the limits of our space were we to attempt a minute analysis of all the papers; moreover, the subject matter of some of them would prove most uninteresting to the general reader. Therefore we propose to select only those that con-

tain new results of science. We may mention for the Section of Mathematics and Astronomy the paper of Professor B. A. Gould, of Cambridge, on the "Photographic Determination of Stellar Position." Twice already we have had occasion to mention in our "Chronicle" the great assistance that Photography has of late afforded Astronomy. We have here a new instance of it. Dr. Gould, after briefly recalling the history of celestial photography, states the work he himself did while he was in charge of the Observatory of Cordova, Argentine Republic. He succeeded in securing nearly fourteen hundred photographic plates of southern star clusters, and he is now engaged in a long work, a reduction of the results, which, no doubt, will increase our knowledge of the southern stars, at present much less known than those of our own hemisphere.

Mr. Chandler's paper on "A Comparative Estimate of Methods and Results in Stellar Photometry" was attentively listened to, and called forth great discussion. Mr. Chandler tried to substantiate by a remarkable number of results the unexpected and, to some, startling statement, that the attempts to determine the relative brightness of the stars, made of late by experimental photometry, had all proved failures and had not disclosed a more uniform scale of magnitude than Argelander's, who, by estimates of the naked eye, determined the stellar magnitudes.

Physics.—Mr. Mendenhall reported the progress which had been made in the study of atmospheric electricity. He noted also a phenomenon, entirely new to him, which happens in the use of resistance coils. He says when a current passes for some time through such coils, upon short circuiting, a reverse current is found to pass through them. The presence of this last current may doubtless be classed under the general head of polarization, but by simple polarization it would be difficult to account for its continuance there for hours.

To the surprise of many, only two papers on electricity were given in this section, and this certainly was not owing to any lack of matter. Perhaps the following little items may interest and please those of our readers who use the electric light. An eminent oculist, after examining the eyes of one thousand one hundred persons who work by the incandescent electric light, failed to find any injurious effects, while it seems that the arc light, at close range and used for long work, is very apt to injure the eye. From a hygienic point of view, either the incandescent or arc light is better than common gas for lighting large rooms. After elaborate experiments made in a Munich theatre, Dr. Breslauer states that gas-light rendered the air of that hall four times as impure as electric light.

Among the most important papers on chemical subjects was that of Professor C. F. Mabery, of Cleveland, Ohio, on "The Decomposition of Certain Products of the Cowles' Electric Furnaces." At last year's meeting at Ann Arbor he contributed a paper on the "Electrical Furnaces," an abstract of which may be seen in the records of that date. In the issue of last January we gave an account of the electrical furnace, and in the last number returned to the same subject, alluding to the new

results obtained. Professor Mabery gives an account of more recent progress. Omitting his controversial remarks on some criticisms by European scientists who had attacked the new method of metallurgy, we may notice that the most remarkable products of the furnace are due especially to the enlargement of the plant, which will receive a still greater development in Lockport, N. Y., by the use of the great Brush dynamo Colossus, built expressly for the purpose. Mr. B. H. Thurston described the new dynamo as the greatest ever built, which has, perhaps, five times the capacity of Edison's famous "Jumbo," that attracted so much attention during the Electrical Exhibition at Philadelphia, in 1884. The Colossus dynamo, when worked at its full power, has a capacity of 300,000 Watts, or is equivalent to 5,000 incandescent lamps of 16 candle power each, and is capable of producing in the electrical furnace enormous heat. The efficiency of these furnaces, even with the present dynamos, may be greatly increased by coating the coarsely powdered charcoal with lime, and thus prevent its conversion into graphite. By this means we get much better products than formerly, among late ones an aluminium iron alloy, resulting from the reduction of aluminium in presence of iron.

Geology.—The papers on Niagara Falls, read so near the famous spot, necessarily proved popular. By a thoughtful choice they were read before the excursion to the great cataract took place, and thus the excursionists were able to verify for themselves the arguments brought forward. Dr. Pohlman, of Buffalo, N. Y., described the district which was to be visited, and, indeed, every tourist should read in full his paper, to understand the lessons that the earth's strata teach us about this wonderful place. Messrs. Woodward and Gilbert, of the Geological Survey, the former having just finished the survey of the Horseshoe Falls, gave in very interesting papers their estimates of the age of the Falls. Professor E. W. Claypole's discourse completed the account, and after him a few others took part in the open discussion. All seemed to be of one mind, and held to the theory that during the glacial epochs Lakes Erie and Ontario formed but one body of water with a much higher level than at present. When the ice began to break and melt, the overflow must have taken a southern direction. And if a dam of twenty-five feet can even now cause an overflow of Lakes Erie, Huron and Michigan past Chicago into the Mississippi, the glaciers certainly must have been able to produce the same effect. As the ice gradually left the St. Lawrence, Lake Ontario fell to the present level, and the surplus waters of Lake Erie took the course they now hold. Comparing the results of the surveys of 1842 and 1872 with those of the last one, it was found that the Falls, at the deepest part of the curve, had retreated about 5 feet per annum, while the whole Horseshoe Falls had receded only one-half that much. It was announced that hereafter exact surveys would be made at shorter intervals of time. From the data at hand, supposing that the rate of erosion was uniform, the learned gentlemen concluded that it must have taken seven thousand years for the Falls to recede from Lewiston to the present spot.

Biology.—Dr. D. E. Salmon, of Washington, D. C., read two papers on “Immunity from a Second Attack of Germ Disease.” There are, said the doctor, three explanations: “First, something is deposited in the body which is unfavorable to the germ. Second, something is withdrawn from it which is necessary for the development of the germ. Third, the tissues have acquired such a tolerance for the germ, or for an accompanying poison, that they are not affected by it.” Dr. Salmon inclined towards the last hypothesis, and, indeed, it seems to agree with recent well-proved facts, among others with Pasteur’s method of inoculation against hydrophobia. This brings to our mind that the committee appointed by the English Government to examine into this method has reported in favor of it, and that many prominent doctors, after much hesitation, are now pronounced followers of Pasteur. We may add, too, and in our opinion it shows the value of his discovery, that some, not daring to deny its importance, pretend that Pasteur has only revived an old method used in France during the great plague some four centuries ago, and in Italy at the end of the last century.

Anthropology.—Vice-president H. Hale, of Clinton, Ontario, Can., read a paper on “The Origin of Languages and the Antiquity of Speaking Man.” After the fashion of most scientists of the present day, he made his profession of Darwinism, and like them, too, he could give no truly scientific reason for his belief. Mr. Hale has peculiar ideas on the theory of evolution, and though he tried to follow the lead of other pronounced Darwinists, he openly contradicted them, as well as himself. Take this admission of his, that man “is somewhere between six and ten thousand years old,” how does he reconcile it with the doctrine of the Master Evolutionist? And the admission is stronger and more valuable when he asserts that “this man who thus appeared was not a being of feeble powers, a dull-witted savage on the mental level of the degenerate Australian or Hottentot of our day. He possessed and manifested, from the first, intellectual faculties of the highest order, such as none of his descendants have surpassed.” Surely this must be the Adam of our Bible. But how did this splendid being come to exist? He says that he had *precursors*, whom others call men; he, however, refuses them that name. ’Tis a strange freak to admit this fact, and stickle at a mere name! But we shall no longer dwell on the examination of Mr. Hale’s inconsistent views.

We shall conclude with the following extract of a novel and ingenious method of getting an insight into the unconscious mechanism of authorship, which was described by Mr. Mendenhall under the title, “Characteristic Curves of Composition.” The method consists in “counting the number of words of each length, from one letter to fourteen, fifteen, or as long as were found, plotting the result on a curve, in which the abscissæ represented the number of letters in a word, and the ordinates the number of words per thousand of each length. It was shown that while the curves resulting from each thousand words was not entirely regular, that resulting from five thousand was more regular, and that from ten thousand almost entirely so. The inference from this was, that

the phenomenon which the curve represented was a regular one, and that it was an expression of a peculiar vocabulary of the author. Moreover, by comparing the respective curves one would be able to judge whether two works were written by the same author, and perhaps even decide the controversy whether Bacon wrote Shakspeare Curves derived from Dickens ('*Oliver Twist*') and Thackeray ('*Vanity Fair*') were remarkably similar, thus suggesting that the subject-matter might cause the peculiarity of the curve, while those of John Stuart Mill ('*Political Economy*' and '*Essay on Liberty*') differed from them in having more long words and fewer short ones, though words of two letters (prepositions mainly) were most abundant in Mill. The average length of the novelists' words was 4.38, and that of the philosopher 4.8."

Book Notices.

MONOTHEISM, IN THE MAIN, DERIVED FROM THE HEBREW NATION, AND THE LAW OF MOSES THE PRIMITIVE RELIGION OF THE CITY OF ROME; an Historical Investigation. By the *Rev. Henry Formby*. London: Burns & Oates,

This book is from the pen of an Oxford scholar, who, forty years ago, received the grace to enter the Catholic Church, from which his fathers, in an evil hour, had separated. Subsequently to his reception into the Church, and still responsive to the light and inspirations of those gratuitous aids which the mercy of God copiously offers to the human will, he received the sacrament of Holy Orders. On March 12th, 1884, he died, with the same solid and exemplary piety which had marked his previous life.

The title of his book succinctly states the leading and comprehensive proposition which he has undertaken to prove. Nor is it merely the Monotheism, which is known to the natural and unaided reason of man, that the Reverend author desires to claim as the original possession and inheritance of the city of Romulus. His purpose is more specialized, since he makes the characteristic mark of this Monotheism consist in being in the main a derivation "from the Hebrew Nation and the Law of Moses"—a quite important aspect of his subject, as there may be scholars who, while prepared to admit that a belief in the one true God was the real and distinguishing religion of primordial Rome, yet do not perceive sufficient evidence to grant the conclusion that this belief was mainly of Israelitish and Scriptural derivation. These scholars would, doubtless, defend their skepticism respecting this point by an appeal to two arguments: (1) That the historical records are too meagre and imperfect to allow of ascribing to the outcast and predatory associates of Romulus, and their descendants, so elevated and magnificent a system as the revealed and super-rational doctrines possessed by the Chosen Nation; (2) That natural principles and causes suffice to explain the real nature of the primitive Roman recognition of God as the sole and

supreme object of worship. Human reason, it is argued, is competent to discover the existence and unity of God: "For, by the greatness of the beauty, and of the creature, the Creator of them may be seen, so as to be known thereby."—(Wisd. Ch. 13.) Why, then, endeavor to explain, by supernatural and extraordinary causes, that which natural ones are adequate to unfold?

"Nor let a god in person stand display'd,
Unless the laboring plot deserve his aid."

Still, the evidence in favor of a scriptural origin for the primeval Monotheism of the Eternal City becomes, under the patient elaboration of Father Formby, so distinct and undeniable that he does not think "any one will very easily commit himself to the desperate expedient of maintaining the possibility of a public religion of Monotheism having been attainable at that time of the world from any other source except solely from the Hebrew people."—(p. 230.)

But after allowing that the Monotheism of ancient Rome was influenced by the inspired and Mosaic law, scholars might differ widely in their estimate of the degree to which the early Roman religion and its public belief and profession were affected by this cause. Some might ascribe very little influence to it, while others might be disposed to exaggerate its importance. Again, there may be not a few strongly inclined to the opinion that the primitive religion of Rome was not Monotheism at all, but Polytheism, derived from the Trojans in the manner described by Virgil when he makes the ghost of Hector address Æneas thus:

"Now Troy to thee commends her future state,
And gives her gods companions of thy fate;
From their assistance happier walls expect,
Which, wand'ring long, at last thou shalt erect." 1

In the chain of evidence, which connects primeval Rome's belief in the true and supreme *Numen Cæleste* with the inspired truths delivered to the Chosen People by the Hebrew prophets, an indispensable link is the precise and circumstantial testimony of St. Clement of Alexandria, "a convert, at an advanced age, from the philosophical school of Greece." St. Clement says, in his "Stromata" (I-xv): "Numa, the King of the Romans, was a Pythagorean, and, assisted by the doctrines derived from Moses, he prohibited the Romans from making an image of God in the likeness of either a man or a beast. The Romans, for the first hundred and seventy years, during which they built temples, did not make a single sculptured or painted image, for Numa had instructed them, after the manner of a secret doctrine, in the truth that it is impossible to attain to the worship of the Most High in any other way than by the mind alone."

In the presence of this distinct and unqualified avouchment by one of such incontestable authority as St. Clement for information and veracity, it would be a clear irrelevancy, if nothing worse, to attempt the employment of any skeptical and pseudo-critical methods of historical investigation, for the purpose of diminishing either the force and fulness, or the accuracy, of his testimony.

It may, however, be observed, in passing, that the motive of "con-

1 "Sacra suosque tibi commendat Troja penates;
Hos cape fatorum comites, his moenia quære
Magna, pererrato statues quæ denique ponto."
—Æneid, lib. ii.

scious bad faith," imputed by our Reverend author to the historian, Tacitus, for his silence respecting the Mosaic origin of the primitive Latin cult, is purely supposititious.

Father Formby, it will be observed, considers the Monotheistic creeds of the Ancient World, in whatever country and race existing, to be a derivation from the tradition and accurate ethical knowledge of Noah, when they are not directly taken from the Jewish people and the Scriptures. "The religion of Monotheism," he insists, "must ever be essentially one and the same, whether it is Hebrew or Roman Monotheism. And though the city of the Gentiles, which can only be in possession of a borrowed light, must stand at a very great disadvantage, as compared with the city and people who have been the object of a special election," etc.

The substance of his sentences, in this connection, may, we take it, be expressed in the thesis that, radically and primitively, the Monotheistic beliefs of the Ancient World originated from the one general source of God's revelation to man. We are not quite sure that we can under all respects agree with the doctrine here proposed by the erudite author, and it will, doubtless, occur to the reflecting reader that a distinction should be drawn between Natural and Revealed Religion, indicating their distinct origin, respective scope, and legitimate meaning. To assert that the systems of worship in which supreme homage is paid to the one true God are all of revealed origin, does not seem to be entirely consistent with the facts of profane history, nor in sufficient accord with the exact and descriptive narration which St. Paul publishes to the Romans. This great Apostle declares that "when the Gentiles, who have not the law, do by *nature* those things that are of the law, these having not the law are a law to themselves."

It was thus to the peculiar credit of the Gentiles that they by nature performed the works which are "of the law," following the light of the supreme and authoritative rule of action impressed upon their rational natures. The Apostle here contrasts the law, *i.e.*, the written and Mosaic law, with nature, and clearly discriminates between those who are in possession of the law and those who are guided solely by the natural light of reason. It is true, the Apostle distinctly attributes, in this connection, a saving and supernatural character to the light and operations of nature; a character clearly such as can belong only to nature influenced and quickened by vital and infused grace, which is never denied to sincere and inquiring souls.¹

The power ascribed by St. Paul to the Gentile religion, of being efficacious in respect to man's real and ultimate destiny, should not, however, be confused with the religious knowledge and works which proceed from, and are totally included in, nature as their principle, reason and the divinely-revealed truths being two simply distinct sources of certainty and operation.

But side-issues apart, it is quite sure that the present work is a scholarly and sober contribution to the religious history of ancient Rome. It contains, at the same time, an antidote for those popular and skeptical delusions, agreeably to which a major portion of all historical events recorded of the early Latin city and people are reduced to the order of myths and spurious marvels; or else it is deemed, in respect to the reality of their occurrence, that they must be classed as merely inter-

¹ "Facienti quod in se est Deus non denegat gratiam."—Theologi passim. "God does not deny grace to any one who diligently employs the natural means in his power to rectitude and justice."

esting probabilities, for that, after the most rigid and complete investigation of reliable records, an insuperable *on ne sait quoi* intervenes, over which they cannot rise to the domain of received history. Such a condition of mind in the student, or searcher after truth, reveals an absolute mistrust of genuine historical documents, and is really a species of that irrational skepticism which was introduced into the thoughts of men through the subtle sophistries of Hume.

STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY. By Rev. Reuben Parsons, D.D. Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati.

This is a scholarly and entertaining volume, covering the first eight centuries of the Church's existence. Its tone throughout is temperate and candid, and although the Rev. author has not designed to produce a "popular" book, he has, nevertheless, completed a volume of more than usual interest to the average reader, and really valuable to the genuine student of ecclesiastical history. He discovers, in all his pages, the actual power, as well as earnest determination to set forth, without partisan coloring, the real facts of this historical period, as they actually happened, and not as they might have occurred in conformity with any preconceived and baseless theory of past events. The set purpose of accurate and truthful narration is the more commendable, in view of the circumstance that the Rev. author has thus avoided the cherished and characteristic delusion of certain writers, who appear to aim at unfolding the scroll of history by *a priori* methods, such as we may suppose an angel of heaven might employ, in the event of his possessing that species of infused knowledge preceding its objects and underived from them, which is attributed to him in St. Augustine's theory of Angelic cognition. But so elevated and independent a manner of knowing, and hence of imparting the knowledge of objects, is far above anything that man can accomplish, at least in his present and sublunary state, in which real objects and events are known only *a posteriori*.

Dr. Parsons judiciously establishes, in the opening pages of his work, that corner stone of ecclesiastical history, the Roman Pontificate of St. Peter. Those without the pale of the Catholic and Roman Church have made the assertion that it was "the ambition of the Roman See" which "gave rise to the opinion that St. Peter was its founder." This charge is validly refuted by Dr. Parsons' direct and unambiguous statement of those facts and circumstances which rest upon incontestable authorities, and show, with complete evidence, that St. Peter resided in the Eternal City, was bishop, and exclusively Pope of Rome.

After a brief, yet thorough consideration of St. Peter's Papal supremacy, Dr. Parsons next reviews the heresies of the first three centuries. The first heretic preserved in the records of Christian annals was Simon, who, from his profession of, and proficiency in, the art of magic, was surnamed *Magus*, *i. e.*, the magician. He it was who tried to purchase from the Apostles, with money, the gifts of the Holy Ghost, and who became, by this means, the cause of the Church's introducing into her vocabulary the hitherto unknown term of "Simony." The doctrines he invented and delivered dogmatically to his followers are of so preposterous a character that it is difficult to imagine how his disciples could have been brought to believe in them, unless we suppose that an unreasoning and fatuous credulity was excited and produced in their minds by the prodigies he wrought subserviently to the art of magic and the power of the devil. He blasphemously asserted that "it was he who had . . . appeared to the Jews in the guise of the Son of God ;

that he had descended at Samaria, as the Father, and that the other peoples knew him as the Holy Ghost. He was always accompanied by a Tyrian woman, named Helen, who had been a common prostitute, and his followers must have been especially interested in her, when they were informed that she was the same Helen who had caused the siege of Troy."¹ "She was declared to be the first conception of his divine mind, and the mother of all men." She was detained on the earth, he alleged, by reason of the love which the fallen angels had conceived for her, and he may have intended it to be supposed that these pure, but malignant spirits had swiftly perceived her inaccessible charms and beauty, and had fallen an easy victim to their influence.

But from Simon's prodigious skill in magic, and from the preternatural marvels ascribed to him, it may be legitimately concluded, and the conclusion is explicitly stated by reliable writers of that day, that Simon met with peculiar success in spreading his errors and deluding the minds of men, to the point of making them his admiring and obsequious disciples. He must have been deeply and incurably versed in the black art, or rather aided in a special and singular manner by evil and superhuman power, when "Nero and some of the first people of Rome succumbed to his illusions."² But having ranged himself in the ranks of revolt set up by Lucifer against the Creator of Angels and of men, he was brought to a tragic and ignoble death through the prayers of St. Peter, whilst he was attempting to prove his divinity by flying through the air.

Simon Magus, as well as his follower, Saturnine, appears to have held, in respect to the origin of the world and of men, a theory which agrees in an essential principle with the one now advocated by the extreme adherents of Agnostic Evolution.

The primeval heretics unite with our evolutionary theorists in denying to God the production from nothing of the visible universe, including the rational inhabitants of our planet; for the creation of these objects was referred to the Angels by these pioneers of error. Modern agnostics, too, refuse to trace back the line of real causes and effects to the point where the First and Creative Cause must be introduced, to account for the providential existence of all secondary realities; and to justify this capricious and illogical method of declining to satisfy the clear and impartial demands of reason, they appeal to their profound ignorance of objects, and modes of production, so alien to the sphere of common experience and known physical laws. Their defence, in short, is an appeal to their blank and agnostic condition of mind respecting the Unknowable.

Later on in the volume, Dr. Parsons discusses the time when Christianity was first introduced into England. Lingard says that "at the distance of so many ages, it is impossible to discover by whom Christianity was first preached in the island."³ Some writers have endeavored to show that St. Peter was the first to break ground in this new field; while others have thought that the honor belonged to St. Paul. Lingard attaches no importance to either of these opinions. But whatever may be the real facts of the case, it is historically settled that Christianity acquired a strong foothold, and flourished in Britain during the reign of Lucius, the great-grandson of Caractacus, about the year 182. The rude and uncultivated Britons were long undisturbed by the controversies and heresies which arose and exerted their baneful effect upon the older

¹ Studies in Church History, p. 27.

³ History of England, vol. i. Chap. i.

² Ibid. pp. 27-28.

and more polished contemporaries of the East. Heresies in abundance had sprung up in the Oriental countries, and had well-nigh spent their violent and ephemeral force, before the Isles of Britain became, about the year 405, the scene of a dark and blighting Pelagianism which denied the necessity of Divine grace for man upon the assumption that he is not born in original sin.

Before concluding the notice of the volume before us, it is expedient to observe that many occasions arise in the work of Dr. Parsons for using extracts from authorities who have written in foreign languages. The English translation of these extracts, so far as our observation has extended, is accurate; but the regret may be expressed that in several instances a higher degree of smoothness and ease has not always been attained consistently with accuracy. We refer especially to what Dr. Hugh Blair styles "inversions" in the structure of sentences, and to what he illustrates by the example, "Into this hole thrust themselves three Roman Senators."

It is not possible, in the space allotted to us, to enter upon a consideration of any other topics developed in "*Studies in Church History*," but we think it only fair to add that the thoughtful pages of Dr. Parsons' book have placed it conveniently within the power of any reader or student to form a close and correct acquaintance with the history of the Church, and the vicissitudes through which she passed, during the first eight centuries of her career.

THE MOTHER OF THE KING. MARY DURING THE LIFE OF OUR LORD. By Henry James Coleridge, of the Society of Jesus. London: Burns & Oates. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. 1886.

This work is a proper supplement to the many excellent volumes which its distinguished author has composed and published on different periods of the life of our Blessed Redeemer, or, rather, it proves a very important part of that series. For, as we are told in Sacred Scripture that when "the wise men from the East," led by the star to the place "where the Holy Babe was, they found the Child, *with Mary, His Mother*," we may truly infer that her life was closely interwoven with His, and that the devout study of one will reflect light upon the other. For the Life of our Lady is in one part of the Life of our Lord, and cannot be separated from it. And it is mainly because of the persistent endeavor of Protestants to sunder what God has joined together,—the Life of our Lord and the Life of our Lady,—that a false conception so generally exists among them as to the position, and office, and work of that Blessed Mother in the Kingdom of her Son. And it is owing to the same cause that so many of them who honestly intend to accept and believe the dogmatic declarations and teachings of the ancient Creeds and Fathers of the Church, respecting the incarnation, and the divine and human natures of our Blessed Redeemer and the unity of His Person, yet accept them merely as barren and unfruitful facts, and having no intimate and necessary relation to our Divine Lord's mission and work, nor to His Church and Kingdom. Hence, while such persons are orthodox as respects their acceptance of the language and outward form of the declarations and definitions of the ancient Ecumenical Creeds, they have no real understanding of their interior meaning, and of their bearing upon, and inseparable connection with, other parts of Christian belief and doctrine.

It is owing to the same lamentable fact, too, that even in the Protestant sects, which are "orthodox" as respects their professed adherence

to the Church's declared dogmas on these subjects, a vast majority of their members (and among these many of their most prominent ministers) have, in reality, consciously or unconsciously, adopted the heretical notions of the Monophysites, of the Nestorians, or of the Arians, or a heterogeneous mixture of them all.

The concise declaration of a distinguished Protestant theologian (whether original with him in the particular form in which he formulated it we know not) is entirely and emphatically true: "He who hesitates to call Mary 'The Mother of God,' with full belief in all that the title implies, stumbles at the Mystery of the Incarnation." Yet this the vast majority of Protestants do, and hence their lack of intelligent, complete, and fruitful belief in the Incarnation, and in all that radiates from it. And hence, the tendency among them (which many of their more earnest and thoughtful ministers acknowledge and lament) to explain away, if not openly deny, the profound truths which grow forth from, and cluster around this central fundamental mystery of the life and religion of Christ.

But, turning away from this, there is a lesson for Catholics in the intimate relation of the Life of our Lady to the Life of our Blessed Redeemer, which they cannot too diligently and earnestly study. Her position, during the life of our Lord, must be regarded and considered as the foundation of the position she afterwards held, and holds, and ever will hold in His Kingdom. Therefore it is very important that we should have a true conception of what the position of Mary during the Public Life of Our Lord was, and how that position itself was the fruit of all that she saw and did, and gained during the Holy Infancy, and the Hidden Life, as well as the foundation of all that afterwards Mary was to be and is.

These are the leading thoughts of the author of the volume before us, the clues which have guided him in his studies of "Mary During the Life of Our Lord."

As the author pertinently says, "the Gospel narratives of the earliest years of our Lord are full of our Blessed Lady." But the part of Gospel history which deals with our Divine Lord's Public Life "makes only a few, and, as it seems, occasional mentions of her." But there is nothing in the divinely ordered history which is only "occasional," in the common sense of the word. For every word and sentence in the divinely inspired Scriptures has been written with a divinely inspired purpose and meaning, sometimes obvious and at other times hidden, that is, hidden from the multitude; but as time rolls on, brought out and revealed, as to their interior meaning, to the few devout souls who, by constant, reverential, profound reflection and meditation and adoration, merit such special revelations.

But, while this is true, it is a fact that ought to be plainly obvious to all readers of the Sacred Scriptures, that the Life of our Blessed Lady was a continuous and most beautiful whole, "a path of justice," like a shining light, going forward, and ever increasing more and more unto the perfect day.

Consequently, the writer of the volume before us consistently says: "It is in harmony with these truths that we should be ready to believe that, during the latter portion of the Life of our Lady, that which ensued after the Ascension of our Lord, she should have had a position and a work in the Kingdom which He had founded, which might be said to grow out of what she was in the Public Life, and in the Holy Infancy" of our Blessed Redeemer before His Public Life began.

Of this latter portion of the Life of our Lady the author does not

treat. The volume before us is confined to a study of her Life up to the eve of the Resurrection. It concludes "with the solemn pause before that glorious fact." For, as the author well says, "The Resurrection was, in truth, the beginning of the new Kingdom, of which the Forty Days were the immediate earthly inauguration, as the Ascension was itself the opening mystery in Heaven above."

The author hopes to make the subsequent portion of the Life of our Lady, and her relation to the Church and Kingdom of Christ, the subject of another volume. It is to be earnestly desired that his hope will be realized.

GERMAN PSYCHOLOGY OF TO-DAY; THE EMPIRICAL SCHOOL. By Th. Ribot, Director of the "Revue Philosophique." Translated from the Second French Edition, by James M. Baldwin, B.A., late Fellow of Princeton College. With a Preface by James McCosh, D.D., LL.D., Lit. D. 8vo, pp. xxi, 307. New York: Ch. Scribner's Sons. 1886.

The arguments by which Positivists seek to prove the invalidity of Metaphysics and the mind's incapability of knowing fundamental truth, and to make Science the mental expression of the relations existing between mere phenomena, when thoroughly sifted, are found to contain their own refutation. It may be on this ground that President McCosh, the veteran foe of Positivism and defender of fundamental truth, introduces, with so much comity, M. Ribot's decidedly positivistic book to English readers. Be this as it may, the French author is far from showing like courtesy to his American introducer. Mr. McCosh, if we may judge him by his latest work, still adheres to the old school of psychology, and of that school M. Ribot speaks in no polite terms, "Though it has cut a good figure enough," he says, "the old psychology is doomed. In the new surroundings that have recently grown up, the conditions of its existence have disappeared. Its methods do not suffice for the increasing difficulties of the task, for the growing exigencies of the scientific spirit. . . . Feeble and old, it makes no progress, and asks only to be let alone, that it may spend its age in peace" (p. 1-2). "It presents a character that is narrow, and, to speak it in a word, childish. It lacks air and horizon," etc. (p. 4). For the *New Psychology*, however, M. Ribot shows high admiration and strong hope. Though still of tender growth, it casts aside all metaphysical leading strings, and throws itself on the safe support and guidance of the natural sciences. The sad "mistake of the old psychology has been that it accepted such creations of the natural consciousness as spirit, reason, intellection, for definite truths. The soul, instead of being considered simply as a logical subject to which we attribute all the facts of internal experience as predicates, has become a real being, a substance, manifested in 'faculties'" (p. 11). This blunder the new psychology is careful to shun. It studies facts only with their relations, seeks particulars, not generalities. "Its domain is, therefore, specific. It has for its object nervous phenomena, accompanied by consciousness. . . The soul and its faculties disappear, and we have to do only with internal events which, as sensations and mental images, translate physical events, or which, as ideas, movements, volition, and desire, are translated into physical events" (p. 8). Such is the present work of the new psychology, but see the bright promise of its future,—"when realizing a progress that it does not dream of now, it succeeds in determining the conditions of all mental action, of whatever sort, as well of pure thought as of perception and movement, then psychology will be *entirely* physiological, and it will be well indeed" (p. 15).

These citations, selected at random, from a large mass of like ranting, will suffice to show the author's "advanced views" as a psychologist. It would be manifestly out of place here to enter into a discussion of these "views." Luckily, they make but the chaff. Those who know how to winnow the good grain which lies in its historical part, will find the work interesting and highly useful. To students of the Scholastic Philosophy it will be of special service. Though insisting on the empiric method as the point of departure in psychological study, the schoolmen, through lack of mechanical instruments, could not always make their observations and experiments as thorough and minute as such assistance would have enabled their making them.

Had microscopes and "psychic laboratories" existed in the days of Aristotle, Bl. Albert, St. Thomas Aquinas, and Suarez, the field of so-called empirical psychology would, doubtless, have been as patiently explored as it has been in modern Germany. Now that recent invention has given us new "external senses," the Christian Philosophy will be alive to what they reveal regarding the phenomena in the lower forms of psychic action, and will know how to make the *laws* thence induced, *principles* from which to make new deductions, whereby to enrich the present wealth of conclusions which constitute the contents of its *science* of the human *soul*. M. Ribot, therefore, by bringing together in convenient summary the results of German research in this department of psychology, has done a service to Catholic philosophy. His work covers the entire literature of the subject. Tracing the rise of the empiric movement with Herbart, he sketches the main features of that writer's psychology, his so-called "*Statics*," and "*Mechanics of Mind*," and his influence in the school which succeeded him. The pertinent parts of Lotze's *Medicinische Psychologie* with its famous *Theory of Local Signs*; the nativists (Müller, Weber, Stumpf), and empiricists (Helmholtz, Wundt), *Theories on The Origin of the Notion of Space*; Fechner's and Weber's interesting discoveries in the Measurement of Sensations; Wundt's exhaustive work on Physiological Psychology; a Treatise on the Duration of Psychic Acts: these points mark the main contents of the book. The author's patience in amassing the fruits of his wide reading is the more to be admired that the greater part had to be drawn from uncongenial atmosphere. Not one of the greatest names (Herbart, Lotze, Fechner, Wundt), whose theories fill his pages, marks a mere empiricist. All of them are infected by the "metaphysical spirit."

Whether English reading students have reason "to be grateful to have M. Ribot's work in their own tongue" (p. vii.), may be doubted. Our positivistic literature is already too rich, and students who are likely to *profit* by the merits of this late accession might have drawn from the French source. But though we may question the desirability of the translation, we cannot find fault with the style in which it has been made. Save an occasional obscurity, almost inseparable from a work of its kind, nothing better could be asked in the way of rendering.

A PRACTICAL INTRODUCTION TO ENGLISH RHETORIC: PRECEPTS AND EXERCISES.
By Rev. Charles Coppens, S.J., author of "The Art of Oratorical Composition."
New York: The Catholic Publication Soc. Co. London: Burns & Oates. 1886.

We have received this second volume on Rhetoric, from the pen of Father Coppens. Together with "The Art of Oratorical Composition," which appeared last year, this forms a thorough course for the use of our colleges and seminaries. As was apparent in the first volume, so here,

we find the educator everywhere animating the preceptor. Not only are the principles laid down according to a clearly marked system, and the definitions exact, but what strikes one most forcibly, in looking over the pages of this "Introduction," is the judgment and good taste shown in the selection of the illustrations and examples from model writers. These are evidently the fruit of extensive and careful reading, regulated by the wish of being really useful in the class-room. There is nothing stereotyped about them, whilst the names in general represent the purest and best authors in our language, and we are taught the particular quality of their excellence. Father Coppens does not shrink from warning against popular names. Whether he points out the brilliant exaggerations of Macaulay's criticisms, or condemns the prudery of society, in ostentatiously avoiding the use of certain excellent English words, or maintains good sense against the exalted culture of Emerson, or Matthew Arnold, everywhere we discover that same respect for truth of every kind, and that moderation which make the educator's power of fixing impressions upon his pupils for good.

We have taken some of the most popular and approved text books, in use in our best schools, and compared them with this new "Introduction to English Rhetoric." The result is in every way—and in some parts to an exceptional degree—favorable to the latter.

Take, of the more important instances, the chapter on History. It is a subject which, for many reasons, requires, more than most branches of a liberal education, a careful tutoring. In the very brief space which Quackenbos devotes to the matter, he states that a history, to be good, must be *true*. Farther on, he says: "The English language has produced many historians of the first rank; among whom Robertson, Hume, and Gibbon." "American literature can boast three names equally great: Bancroft, Hildreth, and Prescott." We all know how eagerly most of the above works are read by our youth, who, unfortunately, acquire little of their style and much of their fatal sentiments. If truth—which implies the use only of authentic documents, accuracy of statement, and absence of false prejudice—be requisite in a historian, how, then, can we allow our children to look up, as to historians of the first rank, to Hume, of whom Father Coppens reminds us that he "so misrepresents many facts as to instil infidelity;" to Gibbon, "who labors to undermine Christianity;" to Bancroft, "who, while patronizing all religions, inculcates indifferentism to all positive teaching." Surely it is not instructing men—which is the proper object of history,—to lead them astray on subjects which it is their highest interest to understand aright." Of Prescott, our author says: "As examples of unreliable documents from which writers have often drawn gross falsehoods, we may mention Limborch and Llorente, who supplied Prescott with most of his misrepresentations."

But let the teacher judge for himself. There are other text books, excellent in point of literary accuracy, and didactic construction, such as Hart's "Composition and Rhetoric," which, if not misleading, as we have instanced Quackenbos to be, are too conservative, aiming at implanting principles upon the mind without anything in the form of applied criticism which might help to educate man. Our "Introduction" has a different and a higher aim. We should not pass by in silence the elaborate chapters on Versification added by Father Brady, S. J. But why the Latin acrostic on p. 287? There hardly appears sufficient reason for putting it there, considering the scope of the book.

On the whole, we earnestly bespeak the patronage of the above work, on the score, simply, of its merits. Unfortunately, it had not appeared

when the learned Committee, appointed by the late Council, drew up a new plan of studies for our Seminaries. We venture to assert that, had they been enabled to examine Father Coppens' book, it would have taken the place of Quackenbos, which is placed on the list, as a guide in English Rhetoric for ecclesiastical students.

CHRISTIAN PATIENCE; THE STRENGTH AND DISCIPLINE OF THE SOUL. A Course of Lectures by *Bishop Ullathorne*. London: Burns & Oates. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Co. 1886.

This is a very beautiful as well as important work; important and beautiful as regards the subject it treats of and the truths it elucidates, and beautiful as regards the manner and style in which the author expresses his ideas. It is the last of a series of three volumes, the object of which is to explain and inculcate "those fundamental principles of the Christian virtues which, from their profundity, are least understood, but which most contribute to the perfecting of the human soul." The first volume of the series, under the title of the "Endowments of Man," establishes the doctrinal foundations of the Christian virtues. The second, under the title of the "Groundwork of the Christian Virtues," treats, chiefly, of Christian Humility, as being the receptive foundation of the other virtues. The third volume, which is before us, treats of "Christian Patience," as being the positive strength and disciplinary power of the soul. Throughout the whole three volumes, the sovereign virtue of Charity is explained.

In his preface, the author says that in the production of this last volume he has "found much less assistance than in the two previous ones, from the Fathers of the Church and the great spiritual writers," because, as a rule, they have "limited their instructions to that side of the virtue which is exercised under sufferings, and only a limited number of them," among whom are St. Zeus, Tertullian, St. Gregory the Great, St. Bonaventure, and St. Catherine of Siena, "have treated of that most important side of the virtue by which it gives strength and discipline to all the mental and moral powers, and perfection to all the virtues."

The author apologizes, altogether unnecessarily, we think, for frequently recurring to the same principles. He states as his reasons for so doing, "that the only solid way of explaining the virtues is by their principles and mutual connections," and that "to do this effectually requires that the same principles be often repeated, as well to fix them in the mind as to show their connection with practical details, and to give those details greater light."

In arranging the truths which enter into his general subject, the author first treats of The Work of Patience in the Soul; then on the Nature and Object of Christian Patience; then on Patience as a Universal Virtue; and then on Christian Fortitude. Then, as reflecting light both on what he has already said, and has still to say, he devotes a chapter to the Patience of the Son of God. In the chapters which follow, he treats of Patience as the Discipline of the Soul, Patience as the Perfecter of our Daily Duties, Encouragements to Patience, the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, Prayer, Patience in Prayer, and on the Cheerfulness of Patience.

The work abounds in profound, suggestive, fruitful ideas, lucidly and beautifully expressed.

LEAVES FROM ST. AUGUSTINE. By *Mary H. Allies*. Edited by T. W. Allies, K. C.S.G. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co. London: Burns & Oates. 1886.

This volume is truly a *multum in parvo*. It is a masterpiece of careful, painstaking, discriminating selection. The amount of labor that must have been expended in selecting from the voluminous works of St. Augustine only enough of what is best to fill less than six hundred pages, when all that he wrote is excellently good, can only be estimated by those who undertake similar, though less difficult, tasks. One of the greatest difficulties encountered by the compiler, unquestionably, must have been that of rejecting rather than collecting what she would employ, from the superabundant material on hand. Nor in the performance of her work has she been under any obligations to previous translators of more or less complete collections of the writings of St. Augustine. An English translation of works of St. Augustine makes up fifteen volumes. The Oxford translation of the Fathers makes several more. But, both together fall far short of containing all the great Saint and Doctor of the Church wrote. As we learn from the preface, by T. W. Allies, her father, the translator and compiler made no use of either of these series. The edition she used was that of the Benedictines, published at Paris in 1679. The choice of the passages selected and the work of translating them are entirely her own.

To persons who have not the means to purchase one of the series of volumes containing collections of St. Augustine's works, or the time to read and study them, this volume will be almost invaluable. Even to those who possess one or another of those collections it will be highly useful. Its title is truthfully suggestive, "Leaves from St. Augustine." They are not leaves gathered at random from the trees he planted, but the most perfect specimen leaves which a keenly discriminating mind with unsparing labor and care could select. They are the pith and marrow of his most valued productions. They will serve, better than any volume that has fallen under our notice, to give the intelligent general reader an idea of "the beauty, the vastness, and the grandeur of mind of one who is said to have acted upon a greater number of men than any one since the time of St. Paul."

ORPHANS AND ORPHAN ASYLUMS. By *Rev. P. A. Bort, L. T. S.* With an Introduction by the Right Rev. C. P. Maes, D.D., Bishop of Covington. Buffalo, N. Y.: Catholic Publication Company.

This is a much needed and an opportune book. The need of Catholic orphan asylums and kindred institutions is increasing among us faster than their enlargement or the establishing of new ones. At the same time the need of more definite and exact ideas of the purposes they should subserve, their true aims and objects, and their proper direction and arrangement, etc., and interior discipline and government, is also increasing.

These needs the work before us is well calculated to supply. It contains brief and concise accounts of the foundation, growth, arrangements and specific objects sought to be attained by all the different orphan asylums in all the Dioceses of the Church in the United States. Along with this are statements of the income, and from what sources obtained, of the various asylums, the number of inmates, the annual expenses, etc. Two hundred and twenty-one institutions are thus mentioned and described.

The concluding chapter contains a number of remarks and reflections

by the author upon the general subject. It also points out how the State has endeavored to copy from the Church, and essays to do the work of charity, but confessedly fails in the attempt. The author points out the cause of this failure, and shows that, while the State ought to assist and furnish funds to sustain the charitable institutions of the Church, yet it can never successfully manage charitable institutions.

The brief Introduction to the work by the Right Rev. Bishop of Covington is an important part of the volume. It sets forth clearly, though concisely, what should be the chief purpose and object of orphan asylums, and insists on its being carefully kept in view. It points out practical mistakes in the location of orphan asylums, their management and discipline, and contains a number of valuable practicable suggestions with respect to all these subjects.

A LAYMAN'S STUDY OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE, CONSIDERED IN ITS LITERARY AND SECULAR ASPECT. By Francis Bowen, LL.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1885. 16mo, pp. 145.

A book written in good style, and in which the author's design, *as expressed on his title-page*, is sufficiently well carried out. The so-called religious papers, with incredible blindness, have praised this book as if it were the quintessence of orthodoxy. Had there been a word breathed in it against the pet doctrines of Calvinism, they would have detected it at once and denounced the author accordingly. But they could not see that Mr. Bowen looks on the Bible only as a great classical work of human, not divine, origin. He thinks, indeed, that in some sense the Bible may be said to contain the word of God, inasmuch as great truths are propounded in it as if they came from divine relation (p. 87). But mixed up with these are other ingredients that are merely the outcome of early Hebrew literature. "Such foreign elements may be rightfully subjected to searching examination and criticism, often to disparaging and destructive criticism; since I do not see why Jewish literature should be exempted from the application of such scrutiny any more than the literature of any other nation, say, of the Hindoos or the Greeks" (*Ibid.*). The history of Balaam and Balak is only a legend (p. 102). Correct statistics, plain and exact narratives of fact do not belong to hoar antiquity (p. 103). Moses only imagined that God appeared to him on Horeb (p. 125). We are not blaming the author for pushing his Protestant principles of private judgment to their logical limits. We are only expressing our wonder at the exaggerated praise bestowed on such a book by Presbyterian and other so-called *religious* papers. It shows how little is left of the doctrine of inspiration in the mind of "orthodox" Protestantism; how little, even, of respect for that Holy Book, which was once an object of their idolatry, and which they are fond of changing, and are now despising, hating, and suppressing; whereas, it seems we are the only ones *left* to do it reverence.

SHORT PAPERS FOR THE PEOPLE (Alethaurion). By Rev. Thomas B. Moore, D.D. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers. 1886.

It is well worth while to briefly state the particular circumstances out of which this volume grew. During some of the earlier years of his life its author lived in a community that was almost exclusively non-Catholic, but in which religious questions were favorite topics for discussion. It was necessary for him, as a Catholic clergyman, to defend the Faith with which he was identified, and he was consequently frequently engaged in

"intellectual," yet "almost invariably friendly battles with non-Catholics." He found that the works explanatory of the Catholic belief, and also those which were controversial, were too heavy to suit his purpose. It then occurred to him that what were most needed and would be most effective, were statements and arguments, "strong but not stilted, trenchant but not murderous, witty but not uncharitable." Accordingly, in 1873, he began to publish in the *Catholic Advocate* the brief, pithy papers which are included in this volume. The author's object has been to produce a book that would entertain and interest, while, at the same time, it would be instructive and profitable, and one that could be read by every one without any strain upon the mind.

In this, we think, he has succeeded admirably well. His style is familiar, easy and light, his methods of statement are simple and direct; and the result is a book which, treating of many various subjects, is calculated to enlist the interest of non-Catholic readers to a much larger extent than would more pretentious and exhaustive treatises.

The opinion we have thus expressed of the work is fully confirmed, we find, by extracts from a large number of commendatory letters from distinguished Prelates of the Church in England, as well as in this country, among whom is His Eminence Cardinal Newman. They characterize it as "useful," "valuable," "entertaining," "attractive, witty and instructive," "fresh and lively," "pithy," "direct and pungent."

ASCETICAL WORKS OF ST. ALPHONSUS. (The Centenary Edition.)

PREPARATION FOR DEATH, OR CONSIDERATIONS ON THE ETERNAL TRUTHS. USEFUL FOR ALL AS MEDITATIONS, AND SERVICEABLE TO PRIESTS FOR SERMONS; MAXIMS OF ETERNITY AND RULE OF LIFE. By *St. Alphonsus de Liguori*, Doctor of the Church. Edited by Rev. Eugene Grimm, Priest of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. New York, Cincinnati and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers. 1886.

THE WAY OF SALVATION AND OF PERFECTION, MEDITATIONS—PIOUS REFLECTIONS—SPIRITUAL TREATISES. By *St. Alphonsus de Liguori*, Doctor of the Church. Edited by Rev. Eugene Grimm, Priest of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. New York, Cincinnati and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers, 1886.

These two books form the first and second volumes of a new and only complete edition in English of the ascetical and dogmatical works of St. Alphonsus de Liguori. The English translation is based upon the French translation from the Italian, published in twenty-seven volumes, of Fathers Leopold Dujardin and Jules Jaques, of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. The works of the Saint on Moral Theology, written by him in Latin, will be untranslated and published in the original text.

In the translated volumes, published and to be published, many of the explanatory notes with which the French translation is enriched are retained. These notes enable the reader to understand more fully the writings of the great Saint and holy Doctor.

The Latin Scripture texts and Latin quotations from the Fathers, which the saintly author inserted in his works, are given as foot-notes at the bottom of the proper pages. The sacred poetry, composed by St. Alphonsus, is interspersed through the different volumes of his ascetical works.

It were needless, if not arrogantly presumptuous, for us to attempt to add our feeble commendations to the splendid testimonials given by almost countless eminent theologians and Sovereign Pontiffs of the Church to the usefulness and value, the power for lucid instruction and

holy edification of the works of Saint Alphonsus. Suffice it to say, that the learned and holy Popes Benedict XIV., Clement XIV., Pius VII., Leo XII., Pius VIII., Gregory XVI., Pius IX., and Leo XIII., have concurred and united in praising and commending them.

TRIUMPHANT DEMOCRACY, OR FIFTY YEARS' MARCH OF THE REPUBLIC. By *Andrew Carnegie*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1886.

Mr. Carnegie, a native of Scotland, and a naturalized citizen of the United States, is possessed of an unbounded admiration for his adopted country, its institutions, its progress, its wealth, prosperity and future promise. He has written the book before us for a double purpose.

One of these purposes is to show "the people, the plain, common folk, the democracy of Britain . . . the prosperity and happiness of this Republic, that they . . . may learn that the government of the people through the republican form is the surest foundation of individual growth and of national greatness."

His other purpose is "to give to the whole body of Americans a juster estimate than prevails in some quarters, of the political and social advantages they so abundantly possess over the people of the older and less advanced lands."

As regards the external aspects of various elements which enter into the industrial, political and social condition of the people of the United States Mr. Carnegie's book is interesting and useful. It is crowded with facts and figures, which he evidently has spent much time and labor in gathering, and great care in arranging and collating. His descriptions of the conditions of life, the occupations, the cities and towns, the education, the agriculture, manufactures, mines, trade and commerce, railways and water-ways, and kindred topics are graphic and of roseate hue.

He has chapters upon Religion, Pauperism and Crime, Art and Music, Literature, etc. But their treatment is statistical, and, if not superficial, is confined to the external aspects of these subjects.

The work is interesting and for some purposes useful, but on some points it is unsatisfactory and one-sided.

THE DIVINE OFFICE CONSIDERED FROM A DEVOTIONAL POINT OF VIEW: From the French of M. l'Abbé Bacquez, Director of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, Paris. Edited by the *Rev. Ethelred L. Taunton, Oblate of St. Charles*. With a preface by His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Catholic Publication Society Co.

This book is intended specially for "priests and ministers in holy orders;" and a most useful and excellent companion it is for all who recite the Divine Office. It is an adaptation rather than a translation from the French, and it does, we think, as its English editor ventures to hope, "supply a want long felt among the clergy and others who have to use the Breviary." For the sake of its literary style and excellent composition it should be the subject of high esteem; but far more so, of course, "for its object and for the end it has in view." Taking the prayers that priests recite each day, the author shows their meaning and beauty, and so "gives an idea of the treasures of wisdom and piety which result from a profound study of them." There can be nothing more interesting nor with which ecclesiastics can occupy themselves with greater advantage. "To say the Divine Office as it ought to be said," remarks Cardinal Manning in the Preface, "would fill us with inex-

haustible matter of mental prayer, for it is the work of the Holy Ghost and of the Saints. The seven hours are seven visits day by day to the heavenly court; our voice is united to the eternal adoration; and our daily office ascends in the Golden Censer with the prayers of the Saints." The Abbé Bacquez tells how this takes place.

THE GREEK ISLES AND TURKEY AFTER THE WAR. By *Henry M. Field, D.D.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1885.

It is a great pity that such a pleasant book of travels should be spoiled by an altogether unnecessary and certainly unprofitable "boasting" of Protestant missionaries and colleges in the Levant countries, while not a word is said of the well-known Catholic Missionary efforts in the same region, nor of the celebrated Catholic University of Beirut. This obtrusion and this omission cannot fail to hurt the feelings of Catholic readers, who would otherwise thoroughly enjoy the bright sketches which the author of "From the Lakes of Killarney to the Golden Horn" knows so well how to strike off. Almost as it were in a panorama he takes the reader from Beirut to Cyprus, thence along the shores of Asia Minor, through the Greek Archipelago, by Smyrna, Mitylene and Troy, through the Dardanelles to Constantinople. With his descriptions he happily combines sketches of character and the most striking historical reminiscences. Apropos of Constantinople he betrays strong symptoms of Turkophobia. Leaving Stamboul, he goes along the Black Sea and through Bulgaria, the story of whose sufferings and liberation he graphically tells, adding thereto an account of the Russo-Turkish War. An account of a trip up the Danube closes the volume, which is furnished with three well-executed maps.

THE RAILWAYS AND THE REPUBLIC. By *James F. Hudson.* New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, 1886.

This is an opportune and a useful volume. The perversion of railways from their original and legitimate purpose, their needless and unjust discriminations, their favoritism to some and their extortionate oppression of others, their corruption of public officials, of municipal corporations, of legislators and courts, by which means they have grown into close corporations which divert trade and traffic from its natural channels and centres, which limit and contract its volume, or unduly expand it; which have become a virtual *imperium in imperio* in our commonwealth, to the great injury of the public interests, the crushing-out of individual enterprise, the making of personal thrift and foresight and honest industry profitless, and the building up of a plutocracy amongst us—these and other facts bearing on the general subject are plainly brought to light in this volume.

The subjects of Railway Domination, Discrimination, Public Obligations and Corporate Practices, the Pooling Policy, the Fictitious Element in Railway Policy, Competition *versus* Combination, are candidly, fairly, and ably treated. Then follow two chapters on "Remedies." The work concludes with a chapter on "Corporations in Politics."

ENGLMANN'S LATIN GRAMMAR. Improved and edited by *P. Augustine Schneider, O. S. B.* Cincinnati: Anton Bicker, 1885. 8vo, pp. 425.

A very good and useful grammar, but too ample and extensive for beginners. A boy is apt to get frightened when he sees the 425 pages

which are to be compressed into his little cranium. The syntax, however, may be gone over twice, leaving out the first time everything but the general rules. The translator from the German original is Father Schneider, a Benedictine of St. Vincent's Abbey, Pennsylvania. The versified rules are, we think, no help to the learner's memory. The affixes or inflexions of the verb are in different type from the root, which is very useful in marking for the boy from the beginning the difference between stem and affix. The word *value* (p. 225, line 12) should be changed into some passive or intransitive verb (to be valued, to be worth, or something of the kind).

SANCTUARY-BOYS' ILLUSTRATED MANUAL, embracing the Ceremonies of the Inferior Ministers at Low Mass, High Mass, Solemn High Mass, Vespers, Asperges, Benediction of the Bl. Sacrament, and Absolution for the Dead. By *Rev. James A. McCallen, S.S.* Published with the approval of the Most Rev. Archbishop of Baltimore. Fourth edition. Baltimore: Foley Brothers. 1886. Small 8vo, pp. 168.

We are glad that this excellent little work has reached its fourth edition. It shows clearly that whatever has intrinsic merit, sooner or later wins its way to popular favor. This "Manual" is the fruit of the author's accurate liturgical studies, and of his mature experience in the teaching and practice of the sacred ceremonies in the Sulpitian Seminary of St. Mary's and in the Cathedral of Baltimore, where they are carried out with wonderful exactness and to the greatest edification of the faithful. We hope that it will soon be everywhere in the hands of the Altar boys and of the Clergy also, to whom it will be an invaluable help in training the young to the service of the Altar.

THE LATIN POEMS OF LEO XIII. Done into English Verse by the *Jesuits of Woodstock College*. Published with the Approbation of His Holiness. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1886.

The poems contained in this volume are on various subjects and were written at various times; but they all breathe the same spirit of fervent piety and devotion, as they are also characterized by like grace of expression. It must have been no easy task to translate them, pregnant as they are with sublime and holy ideas and conceptions, faithfully rendered into English, rude and unformed as that language is in comparison with classic Latin, and compressed in thought and elegant and polished in diction as these poems are. Yet difficult as was the work, "the Jesuits of Woodstock College" undertook it, and they have well performed it.

The typographical setting, in which Messrs. John Murphy & Co. have placed these poetic gems, befits their lustre and value.

THE LIFE OF FATHER LUKE WADDING, FOUNDER OF ST. ISIDORE'S COLLEGE, ROME, ETC. By the *Rev. Joseph A. O'Shea, O.S.F.* Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1885.

The literary execution of this book does not render it worthy of the great subject to whom it is devoted. One of Ireland's most glorious ecclesiastics of the "Reformation" period deserves a more exhaustive and a better written biography; and we are glad to learn that such a monument is to be raised to the memory of the author of "Scriptores Ordinis Minorum," and "Annales Minorum." This, however, may be only a remote possibility, and until then, Father O'Shea's memoir, which, by the way, is furnished with a fairly well-executed portrait, will serve to revive in the minds and hearts of Irishmen the memory of one who did them honor in the Eternal City.

70744

PERIODICAL

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

